INSIDE THE ROMAN CHURCH

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_KU-597-367

INSIDE THE ROMAN CHURCH

By

ONE WHO WAS THERE

A General Survey with Special Reference to Great Britain

J. W. POYNTER

Formerly a prominent Roman Catholic writer, and member of R.C. Societies and Committees

LONDON
THE EPWORTH PRESS
J. ALFRED SHARP

First Edition - *March*, 1930
Second Edition - *September*, 1930

Made and Printed in Great Britain by
The Camelot Press Limited,
London and Southampton

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
	PREFACE	7
I.	GROWTH AND CLAIMS OF THE ROMAN CHURCH	13
II.	THE 'TEMPORAL POWER' OF THE POPES .	37
III.	THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH THROUGHOUT THE WORLD	51
IV.	THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN GREAT BRITAIN	75
V.	ROMAN CATHOLIC LITERATURE . . .	97
VI.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . .	121
	APPENDICES	
I.	THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS	141
II.	ROMAN CANON LAW	150
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	155
	INDEX	157

PREFACE

SINCE the ending of the Great War there has been in England a marked increase in the intensity of the propaganda of the Roman Catholic Church. There are several reasons for this. First of all, that Church in this country has been freed from the grave hindrance to its activities which, previous to 1921, was caused by one source of disunion in its own body. The majority of Roman Catholics in this country consists of people who are either Irish or of Irish connexions. There has always been, however, a minority of 'English Catholics'—old families who preserved their allegiance to the unreformed faith during and after the Reformation. Certain aristocratic families—such as the Howards, with the Dukes of Norfolk at their head—were and are, in a sense, the 'lay leaders' of this non-Irish section. Before the War—and, to a considerable extent, even now—that section tended towards support of the Conservative Party in politics. Before the War, opposition to Home Rule in Ireland was a main 'plank' in the Conservative 'platform.' The 'Tory' section of English Roman Catholics strongly supported that opposition. On the other hand, the Irish section was, naturally, vehemently in favour of Home Rule. Many Roman Catholic parishes—or 'missions,' as they were then called—in this country had been built up mainly by the money and efforts of Irish immigrants; and, as has been mentioned already, the Irish section of Roman Catholics made up by far the majority of that Church's membership in this country.

These causes produced a very grave division in the Roman Catholic ranks. Leading Roman Catholic aristocrats appeared on platforms in opposition to political policies which were passionately dear to the hearts of the greater number of their co-religionists in this country. At

the same time, the majority of Roman Catholic bishops here were chosen from the English section. It will be realized, then, how great was the cleavage in the Roman Catholic ranks. All this has been healed since the Irish Treaty of 1921. Before that event, Roman Catholicism here was split with an apparently hopeless schism: none the less real and (from the ecclesiastical point of view) mischievous because it was political and not religious. Any estimate of the Roman Catholic question in this country, then, must take full account of that division and its cessation. People who, in 1911, would not walk on the same side of the street as one another, are now working amicably side by side.

This book is designed to give—so far as limits of space allow in so big a subject—a comprehensive account of the present position, with an estimate of the probable future of the Roman Catholic Church, especially in this country. It will not be written in a bitter spirit of mere antagonism. The writer is convinced that the Roman Church is committed to some dangerous errors, but he is also aware of the great part it has played in history, and of the very great element of nobility and holiness which exists in it as in other Churches. Moreover, he was a member of it for eighteen years, and he is not disposed to make a mere spiteful attack on the Church wherein for a considerable time he received the grace of Christian sacraments. What has to be aimed at is the simple truth. Where things are wrong and dangerous, say so. Where they are good, say so also.

The writer was received into the Roman Catholic Church at the Benedictine Church at Ealing, London, in December 1907. He was a youth then, and, though of Free Church ancestry, had never belonged to, or even been baptized in, any other Church. Thus, the Roman Catholic was the only religious body with which he had had active association. There can be no doubt that the life and spirit of that Church have elements of strength, attraction, and retention, which can be understood only by those who have belonged

to it. It claims to be the One True Church. It surrounds its members with its influence in all the affairs of their life. Its devotions are many and most potent. Sacramental Confession ; frequent (according to a decree of Pope Pius X, ' even daily ') Holy Communion ; pious Guilds such as that of the Blessed Sacrament, or those of ' Bona Mors ' (' for a good death '), the Apostleship of Prayer, the Children of Mary (for young women), the Knights of the Blessed Sacrament, &c. : these provide an element of constant association together in pious works. Then there are devotions like the Mysteries of the Rosary. This is a peculiar form of prayer little understood by Protestants. The Rosary is a string of fifty small and five large beads, with a crucifix at the end. The five large beads divide the fifty small into tens (' decades '). The devotion consists in passing the beads through the fingers, saying at each large one the *Paternoster* (' Our Father ' prayer), and, at each small one, the *Ave Maria* (' Hail Mary ' prayer). Each decade has assigned to it a ' mystery,' which has to be made the subject of meditation while saying the prayers. There are fifteen of these mysteries : Five ' Joyful ' Mysteries (the Annunciation, the Visitation, the Birth of Jesus, the Presentation in the Temple, and the Finding of Jesus in the Temple), Five ' Sorrowful ' (the Agony in the Garden, the Scourging of Jesus, the Crowning with Thorns, the Carrying of the Cross, and the Crucifixion), and Five ' Glorious ' (the Resurrection, the Ascension, the Descent of the Holy Ghost on the Apostles, the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin into Heaven, and the Coronation of the Blessed Virgin in Heaven amidst the Glory of All the Saints).

Meditation on the ' mysteries ' is an essential part of this devotion ; mere mechanical utterance of the prayers is insufficient. It will be seen that it is a devotion calculated to have a deep effect on a person who habitually uses it. Another powerful devotion is the Way (or ' Stations ') of the Cross. Round the walls of every Roman Catholic church are fourteen pictures. They represent : Jesus condemned

to death ; Jesus made to carry the cross ; Jesus falls the first time under the cross ; Jesus meets His mother ; Simon of Cyrene helps to carry the cross ; Veronica wipes the face of Jesus ; Jesus falls the second time ; Jesus speaks to the daughters of Jerusalem ; Jesus falls again ; Jesus is stripped by the soldiers ; Jesus is nailed to the cross ; Jesus dies ; Jesus is taken from the cross ; Jesus is placed in the tomb. The priest, with an acolyte or server carrying a crucifix, passes from picture to picture round the church, the people following either actually or with their eyes, and at each 'Station' some simple prayers are said ; for example : 'Consider the meeting of the Son and Mother, which took place on this journey. Their looks became like so many arrows to wound those hearts which loved each other so tenderly. My sweet Jesus, by the sorrow Thou didst experience in this meeting, grant me the grace of a truly devoted love for Thy most holy mother. . . . I love Thee, Jesus, my Love, above all things ; I repent of ever having offended Thee. Never permit me to separate myself from Thee again.'

It will be seen, this again is a devotion likely to exercise a potent effect on those who use it. Then there are devotions to the innumerable saints ; the Blessed Virgin especially, and the 'Little Flower' (St. Theresa of Lisieux), St. Francis of Assisi, St. Patrick, St. Bernadette of Lourdes, and the very many others. Again, owing to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, all Roman Catholics believe that the Host, reserved in the Tabernacle on the Altar, is in actual reality Jesus Christ. Therefore they constantly pay solitary visits to the churches to pray before the altar. Finally, there are the Indulgences, by which, as it is believed, some of the punishment due in purgatory is remitted to all who properly say certain prescribed prayers, under conditions assigned by the Pope or his delegate. Such Indulgences are attached to the recitation of the Rosary, to the making of the 'Stations,' and, in fact, to endless forms of work and prayer. They are an important element in the life of the pious Roman Catholic.

From the foregoing short references to only some of the elements in the life of pious Roman Catholics, it will be seen that their religion is one which can dominate the whole of their lives with the ever-present influence of the Church.

Yet, powerful though the system seems, it may be said to be a chain which is as weak as its weakest link. The whole system is bound up with the autocratic system of government centring in the Papacy. Any Roman Catholic who wilfully and persistently denies even one single doctrine declared to be ' of faith,' is thereby cut off from all. He cannot rightly go to Communion ; he cannot profit by any devotions ; he is, in short, cut off from God's grace. In short, the very elaborateness of the system has this fault ; it makes the grace of God contingent on obedience, by all Christians, to an ecclesiastical autocracy. Thus it sets undue limits to the grace of God.

After my reception into the Roman communion in 1907, I entered heart and soul into its life. I went frequently to confession and Holy Communion ; I belonged to the Guild of the Blessed Sacrament and other pious societies ; and I became an active controversialist in the Press in defence of Roman claims. It was this very activity which eventually disillusioned me as to those claims. In order to defend them, I had to read ' both sides.' Having a mind given to the candid weighing of arguments and evidence, I became aware of the unexpected strength of the case against Rome. It was, however, after joining the Westminster Catholic Federation that the definite disillusionment occurred. I have nothing to say personally against my former fellow workers therein or against other individual Roman Catholics. I retain some as friends still, and I think kindly of all—*as individuals*. It is *the system* which is at fault. As to my own zeal in its defence, I have many written and printed testimonies from clergy and laymen : from the Bishops of Plymouth, Southwark, and Brentwood ; from Bishop John Vaughan ; from

Archbishop (then Father) Downey ; from Dr. Herbert Vaughan ; from Mr. A. Hilliard Atteridge ; and in the *Catholic Gazette*, *The Universe*, the Bombay *Examiner*, the *Catholic Times*, the Hong Kong *Rock*, &c. It was not any personal grievance which estranged me, but a reluctant conviction that the ' ecclesiastical machine ' is too worldly, too autocratic, and that its special claims, though they had fascinated me for a period, are erroneous. When I saw this secular autocracy in actual working, I was driven to a conclusion I thus expressed in a little book (*Roman Catholic Propaganda*) in 1928 : ' Were the Roman Catholic Church fully represented by the à Kempises, the Colets, the Sir Thomas Mores, the Actons, things would not be as they are when we have to remember the Inquisitions, the Index, the worldly ambition which has been an essential element in ecclesiastical development ; the bitter intolerance which made even Sir Thomas More a persecutor. One may be sorrowful—one may wish that the piety and holiness represented the full reality ; but one must remember Christ's words (Matt. xx. 25–6) : " Jesus called them to Him, and said, You know that the princes of the gentiles lord it over them, and they that are the greater exercise power upon them. *It shall not be so among you.*" '

J. W. P.

March, 1930.

NOTE TO SECOND EDITION

This book has had a far more favourable reception than the author had ventured to hope ; but a few remarks concerning some criticisms (mostly friendly), may be useful. It has been suggested, for example, that the book omits to deal with some important aspects of Roman Catholicism, such as finance. In 160 pages, however, one can make only a selection of aspects of so large a matter as Roman Catholicism. Perhaps in another book others may be dealt with.

GROWTH AND CLAIMS OF THE ROMAN CHURCH

Chapter I

GROWTH AND CLAIMS OF THE ROMAN CHURCH

Writing two hundred and fifty years ago, the celebrated English theologian, Isaac Barrow, said: 'The Romish pretence transforms the Church into a worldly frame, united by the same bands of interest and design—managed in the same manner, by terror and allurement—supported by the same props of force, of policy, of wealth, of reputation, and splendour—as all other secular corporations are.'[1]

Barrow was a definite opponent of the Papal claims, and his book was written against them. Let us quote, then, a famous Roman Catholic writer of our own days—Dr. (Canon) William Barry: 'The Church and the Empire—an ecclesiastical order with its own courts, jurisdiction, properties, immunities, facing a secular order with its tenures, claims, ambitions; and above each its crowned representative supreme—such is the shape into which Christian society falls during the Middle Ages.'[2]

The Church of Christ—the Church which teaches the doctrines of the wandering Teacher of Palestine of whom it is related[3] that He 'had not where to lay His head,' and that, when He was offered 'all the kingdoms of the earth,' He replied: 'Get thee behind Me, Satan'—the Church of this Teacher, on the Papal hypothesis, must be a visible kingdom on earth: not symbolically so, or so in a spiritual sense, but a kingdom with a visible king, with territory, with princes, with soldiers.

[1] *Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy* (1680), quoted from 1852 reprint, p. 161.

[2] *The Papacy and Modern Times* (1911), p. 20.

[3] Matt. viii. 20.

Let it not be supposed that this was merely an idea which was confined to the Middle Ages. It is the Papal conception *now*. Pope Leo XIII said, in 1888 : ' Others [i.e. Liberals] oppose not the existence of the Church, nor could they indeed ; yet they despoil her of the nature and rights of a perfect society ; and maintain that it does not belong to her to legislate, to judge, or to punish, but only to exhort, to advise, and to rule her subjects in accordance with their own consent and will. By such opinion they pervert the nature of this divine society, and attenuate and narrow its authority, its office of teacher, and its whole efficiency ; and at the same time they aggrandize the power of the civil government to such an extent as to subject the Church of God to the empire and sway of the State, like any voluntary association of citizens. To refute completely such teachings, the arguments often used by the defenders of Christianity, and set forth by Us, especially in the Encyclical Letter *Immortale Dei* [on ' The Christian Constitution of States ' (1885)], are of great avail ; for by those arguments it is proved that, by a divine provision, all the rights which essentially belong to a society, that is legitimate, supreme, and perfect in all its parts, exist in the Church.'[1] And, writing of the claim of the Popes that they must rule over a territorial kingdom on earth, the same Pontiff said : ' It cannot be called in question that in the making of treaties, in the transaction of business matters, in the sending and receiving ambassadors, and in the interchange of other kinds of official dealings, they [secular rulers] have been wont to treat with the Church as with a supreme and legitimate power. And assuredly all ought to hold that it was not without a singular disposition of God's providence, that this power of the Church was provided with a civil sovereignty as the surest safeguard of her independence.'[2]

[1] Encyclical letter, *Libertas Praestantissimum Donum*, on Human Liberty. (See *The Pope and the People*, Catholic Truth Society (1929), pp. 91–2.)

[2] Encyclical *Immortale Dei*. (See *The Pope and the People*, p. 51.)

Indeed, the Treaty of the Lateran, signed on February 11, 1929, and ratified on June 7, between Italy and the Papacy, reaffirmed this claim ; and Pope Pius XI, speaking on that Treaty, said: ' The sufficiently definite conditions essential to the Holy See and the Roman Pontiff, with which by Divine Providence he was invested . . . could not be obtained if the indispensable condition of Sovereignty (at least in the present state of the story) was lacking—that is, a certain measure of territory.'[1]

The Church of Christ, then, must be a visible kingdom on earth, ruled over by a King, with territory, ambassadors, soldiers, and all the ensigns of earthly political sovereignty. It must NOT have for its motto the words, ' My Kingdom is not of this world.'[2] It must be a politico-religious organization : ' An ecclesiastical order with its own courts, jurisdiction, properties, immunities . . . [and with] its crowned representative supreme.' Such being the Papal conception of Christianity, it is interesting to glance at how it developed in the history of Europe.

' Before the conclusion of the fifth century '—to quote Hallam—' the mighty fabric of empire, which valour and policy had founded upon the seven hills of Rome, was finally overthrown, in all the west of Europe, by the barbarous nations from the north, whose martial energy and whose numbers were irresistible. A race of men, formerly unknown or despised, had not only dismembered that proud sovereignty, but permanently settled themselves in its fairest provinces, and imposed their yoke upon the ancient possessors.'[3] Or, in the words of Dr. (Canon) William Barry : ' In the night of the 24th of August, 410, Alaric, King of the Western Goths, entered Rome with his army, by the Salarian Gate—outside which Hannibal had encamped long ago—and took the Imperial City. . . . When the Gothic trump sounded at midnight, it announced that

[1] See *The Treaty of the Lateran* (Burns & Oates, London, 1929), p. 68.
[2] John xviii., 36.
[3] Hallam, *Middle Ages*, p. 1.

ancient history had come to an end, and that our modern time was born. St. Jerome, who in his cell at Bethlehem saw the Capitol given over to fire and flame, was justified from an historical point of view when he wrote to the noble virgin Demetrias, "Thy city, once the head of the universe, is the sepulchre of the Roman people." '[1]

Amidst this calamitous fall of an ancient imperial power, the only organization in Rome that stood intact was that of the Church which, surviving a long and bitter series of persecutions from the pagan Emperors, had been, first, recognized as a legal religion, and then as the religion of the Empire. What was the origin of the Roman Bishopric—the Papacy, as it is now called?

Considering the lofty claims it has made for now so many centuries, it is surprising in what obscurity the beginning of the Roman Bishopric is involved. It is true, Roman Catholics say that its charter rests, by divine right, on these words of Jesus: (Matt. xvi. 18, 19), 'I say unto thee, that thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven'; and (Luke xxii. 31–2), 'And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have *you* [plural: all the Apostles], that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for *thee* [singular: Peter only], that *thy* faith fail not: and *thou*, being once converted, confirm thy brethren'; and (John xxi. 15–17) those in which Jesus specially singled out Peter, three times, enjoining him to 'feed My lambs,' 'feed My sheep.'

What evidential value, however, for the Roman Catholic theory, either of the Roman Papacy or of the supremacy of St. Peter amongst the Apostles, have these words? The words recorded in St. John have no evidential value at all, being merely a command of a general nature applicable to any Apostle, and implying no supremacy; the reason for addressing them especially to Peter may have been merely because, as he had denied his Master, he needed

[1] *The Papal Monarchy* (1902), p. 1.

special encouragement. The words in St. Luke probably had a similar meaning ; Jesus may have meant that Peter having repented of his denial (having ' been converted '), he was being encouraged to make up for his fall by being in future an aid rather than a hindrance to his comrades. As for the words in St. Matthew, their assumed value as the charter for a supremacy amongst the Apostles is disproved by one striking fact : the famous ' confession of Peter ' (his profession of Christ's Divinity), which in Matthew precedes the words, ' Thou art Peter . . .', is recorded also in two other gospels—Mark viii. 27–30, and Luke ix. 18–21,—yet *in neither case is there any record of any words by Jesus about building His Church on ' this rock.'* Is it conceivable that, if those words were the Divine charter for the permanent supremacy of a Papacy, two Gospels out of three would have omitted them though recording the words of Peter which preceded them ? (I do not deal, here, with the theory, held by some critics, that the ' thou art Peter ' passage was no original part of Matthew's Gospel at all, but is an interpolation. I believe the passage to be authentic, and, in any case, I here assume it to be so.) The words, however, might intelligibly have been omitted if they referred not to any supremacy of Peter but to *Christ's Divinity* as the rock-foundation of the Church : for that Divinity permeates the whole New Testament, and the omission of one or more particular passages testifying to it makes no difference. The same, however, cannot be said of any supposed supremacy of Peter, for the case in favour of that rests on selecting such texts as seem in any way to tell in its favour and omitting or explaining away the multitude which do not. For example, if Peter was supreme amongst the Apostles, how could St. Paul have written thus ? (2 Cor. xi. 23, 28) : ' They are the ministers of Christ : (I speak as one less wise) I am more ; . . . Besides those things which are without : my daily instance *the care for all the Churches.*' (It may here be remarked, in passing, that these words ' the care for all the Churches,'

are frequently used by Popes as applying *to themselves*, as successors of St. Peter. Pope Pius VII used them, in Latin—*Solicitudo omnium ecclesiarum*—as the first words of the Bull by which he re-established the Society of Jesus. Yet the words are not Peter's, but Paul's !) Clearly, St. Paul knew of no supremacy of Peter. The fact is, that supposed supremacy is not supported by a fair examination of the New Testament.

Even *if* St. Peter *had* a certain personal pre-eminence amongst the first Apostles, it would by no means follow that such pre-eminence was to be handed down for ever to his successors. A pre-eminence for which (if it existed at all) there is no convincing New Testament evidence, and much, indeed, to the contrary; such a pre-eminence could have been no more than personal and temporary. In any case, where in the New Testament is there any reference to it in connexion with Rome? Even the *Catholic Dictionary* says: 'The New Testament itself is silent about St. Peter's presence at Rome, except that St. Peter, in his first Epistle, sends greetings from the Church in Babylon (1 Pet. v. 13), which all ancient writers with, so far as we know, only one late and insignificant exception (that of Cosmos Indicopheustes), understand to mean Rome.'[1]

Thus we conclude (1) there is no New Testament proof of any supremacy of Peter; (2) even if Peter had a (temporary and personal) pre-eminence, there is no New Testament evidence at all that it was to go to any successors, at Rome or elsewhere.

Turning from the New Testament to general historic evidence, we are struck by the obscurity of the early records of the Roman Bishopric. It is true that Addis and Arnold's words express the general Roman Catholic contention: 'St. Peter's connexion with the Roman Church as its founder is proved by historical evidence which cannot be set aside, except by an extreme scepticism which would

[1] Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary* (ed. 1917), p. 670.

serve equally to undermine the historical character of the New Testament.'[1] What, however, is it that has to be proved in order to vindicate Papal contentions? *Not* merely ' St. Peter's connexion ' with the Roman Church, or even merely his connexion as its ' founder,' *but*—that he was *its first bishop*, and that, as such, he was regarded as *head of all bishops*. *That* is what has to be proved.

Yet, if any historical problem is obscure, it is the one surrounding Peter's connexion (if any) with Rome. How can a universal divine-right supremacy be proved by evidence so dubious that historians have come to opposite conclusions as to its meaning? This, however, is so in the case with which we are dealing.

The Roman Catholic writer, the late Mr. C. F. B. Allnatt, says : ' St. Peter, Bishop of Rome.—The historical evidence of this fact, derivable from extant writers and Councils of the early Christian Church, is full and clear.'[2] He supports this contention by quotations from the Church historian Eusebius (who wrote over two hundred and fifty years after St. Peter died), St. Cyprian (A.D. 250), Firmilian of Caesarea (contemporary of Cyprian), Hippolytus (A.D. 225), and others —of whom the earliest (Hegesippus) was A.D. 160.

Mr. Allnatt's contention, and his arguments and quotations in its favour, represent the recognized Roman Catholic case. What, however, do we find in reality? The Roman Catholic contention, till recently, was that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years. This is so untenable that it has been given up by reputable Papal historians, and is replaced by the argument that, anyway, he was Bishop there for at any rate some unknown period. Even this, however, is far from proved, and one of the latest students of the subject[3] concludes that the evidence for St. Peter having been Bishop of Rome can be traced backwards from

[1] *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 670.

[2] *St. Peter in Rome* (Catholic Truth Society, London), p. 9.

[3] E. T. Merrill, *Essays in Early Christian History* (Macmillan, London, 1924).

now without a break—*to about four generations after St. Peter lived* ; then, it vanishes, at the very and crucial moment it is most important ! D, contends Mr. Merrill, got the story from C ; C got it from B ; B got it from A ; and A just guessed it.

What is the conclusion of the whole matter ? The most that can be said is that it is an arguable contention that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome. It is, however, impossible to found claims, so colossal as the Papal, on a basis so dubious as this. We *may* believe Peter was Bishop of Rome ; but there is *no* evidence that he was a Pope of the Universal Church.

When we look at the history of the time of the Early Church, what do we find ? To quote the Rev. F. W. Puller : 'The local Church of Rome was organized in early times in precisely the same way as the local churches in other cities. Each local Church was governed by a bishop, who had his priests and deacons to assist him. When the bishop of any Church died, his successor was normally chosen from among the priests or deacons who formed the clergy of that Church. This was the rule at Rome, as it was the rule elsewhere. The bishops of the various Churches looked on each other as brothers and colleagues. When Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, writes to Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, he begins his letter as follows : " Cornelius to Cyprian, his brother, greeting " ; and he concludes with the words, " Fare thee well, dearest brother." And when Cyprian replies, he writes in the same strain : " Cyprian to Cornelius, his brother, greeting " ; and he goes on, " you have acted, dearest brother, with diligence and affection, in dispatching to us in haste Nicephorus the acolyte." We have various letters written by St. Cyprian to other Roman bishops besides Cornelius, as, for example, to Lucius and to Stephen [A.D. 252, 253], and they are all written in the same tone of perfect equality. Similarly, when St. Cyprian writes to another African bishop about the Roman pope, he alludes to him, not as a superior, but as an equal. To Pompeius,

Bishop of Sabrata, Cyprian says, " since you have desired to be informed what answer our brother Stephen returned to my letter, I have sent you a copy of that answer, on reading which you will more and more discover his error." Stephen is, of course, the Pope.'[1]

Let us take a crucial test case : the Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325). This was the first—and undoubtedly the most momentous—Council of Christian bishops ever held. It dealt with the supreme problem of the Divinity of Christ. Surely, were the Roman Bishop really the head of the Church, he would have exercised his teaching office there ! Yet what happened ? Let us quote a learned modern English Roman Catholic writer : ' Who was the president ? Pope Sylvester could not come. Had he wished his legate to preside he must have sent a bishop. In fact, he was represented by two priests. Probably Hosius of Córdova—who alone signed before these two legates—presided. A Greek historian, Gelasius of Cyzicus, in a somewhat mythical history of the Nicene Council, written one hundred and fifty years later, of which part only has been printed, repeatedly makes Hosius president and representative of the Pope. . . . It is much more likely that [the Emperor] Constantine nominated Hosius as president, and that the bishops were glad to agree. Mediaeval canon law rightly says that the convocation, the presidency, and the confirmation of ecumenical councils belong to the Pope. . . . Did the Pope solemnly confirm it [Nicaea] ? . . . I am inclined to think that no Papal confirmation was ever given.'[2]

It is curious to notice how even so great a man as the late Cardinal J. H. Newman was compelled to resort to a strange sophism to elude the many facts of early Church history which tell against the Papal claim to supremacy over the whole Christian Church. When he was in the Church of

[1] *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome* (Longmans, 1893), pp. 8–9.

[2] Abbot (then Dom—simple monk) J. Chapman, *The First Eight Councils* (Catholic Truth Society, 1908), pp. 10–11.

England, he wrote the *Via Media of the Anglican Church*, in which he was strongly anti-Papal, contending, for example, that the modern Papal claims are opposed to the facts of early Church history. In 1877, when revising the book from a Roman Catholic point of view, he added footnotes refuting his former anti-Roman contentions. Here (see *V.M.*, i., 180) is one of those notes: 'It seems to me plain from history that the Popes from the first considered themselves to have a universal jurisdiction, and against this positive fact the negative fact, that other Sees and countries were not clear about it, does not avail. The doctrine doubtless was the subject of a development.'

That is to say, a claimant has only to show that he himself has persistently maintained his claims, and, in that case, other (even if positively antagonistic) evidence matters little or nothing. In what sphere of life, however, would reasoning, such as this of Newman's, be admitted? Moreover, it is what in logic is called a 'vicious circle'; 'the Pope's claims are right; why?—because he says so; how do I know he is right in so saying?—because he cannot be wrong!' Furthermore, if it is 'plain from history' that the Popes always claimed 'universal jurisdiction,' how strange that they missed the crucial opportunity of Nicaea!

'The doctrine doubtless was the subject of a development'! That is just it!—Papal supremacy grew up as a result of natural political causes, and not from any Divine appointment—and, it may be remarked, it would never have developed, as it has done, except for the removal of the check which disappeared when the Eastern and Western Churches were separated in the tenth and eleventh centuries. The Emperor Constantine founded 'New Rome' (Constantinople) as a second capital of the Empire. As, thereafter, the Old Rome on the Tiber saw little of the Emperors, the Roman Bishops grew greatly in importance, while the Eastern Churches drifted further from their influence. A learned Roman Catholic writer says, of this separation of the Eastern and Western Churches: 'To tell

the story of what is remembered in Church history as the Great Schism, one would have to discuss three questions: First, the friction between East and West that goes back a very long way, at least to the fourth century; secondly, the first schism at the time of Photius [Patriarch of Constantinople] in the ninth century; thirdly, the second and final schism under Cerularius [a later Patriarch of Constantinople] in the eleventh century.'[1] True!—but what does this come to?—except that the developments, both of the Eastern Church and of the Papacy in the West, were normal natural processes, and not Divinely-ordained appointments essential to Christian Revelation?

The same conclusion follows when we turn from the *government* of the Roman Catholic Church and examine the process by which its strictly *theological doctrine* has developed. Here we meet with a strange thing.

It is a maxim of Roman theology that Christian doctrine is a Revelation which was once and for all finally delivered by Christ, and to which no addition can be made. 'That Revelation was given in its entirety by Our Lord and His Apostles. After the death of the last of the twelve it could receive no increment.'[2] 'The dignity and perfection of Christian Revelation require that no further public Revelation is to be made.'[3] 'The Church is a living witness to a revelation which is final, from which nothing can be taken away, and to which nothing can be added.'[4] Such, in the words of recognized theologians, is the Roman Catholic position as to the finality of Revelation. What, however, does history show?

[1] Rev. Dr. Adrian Fortescue, *Rome and Constantinople* (Catholic Truth Society, 1908), p. 5. (Note.—The term, 'Great Schism,' is also used, in a longer form—'Great Schism of the West'—for the time 1387–1417—when the Western Church itself was divided between two, or even three, rival Popes at once.)

[2] Rev. G. H. Joyce, S.J., in the *Catholic Encyclopaedia*, xiii., 4.

[3] Wilhelm & Scannell, *Catholic Theology*, i., 14.

[4] Abbot (then Dom) J. Chapman, *Bishop Gore and the Catholic Claims* (Longmans, 1905), p. 25.

Throughout the centuries, the Roman Church continually has added to the number of dogmas which it declares must be believed, by all, as being parts of Divine Revelation. How can that fact be reconciled with the maxim that ' nothing can be added ' to Revelation : that ' no further public Revelation is to be made ' ?

Of course, every student knows the usual Roman Catholic answer to that question. The Church, they say, does not make any additional Revelation, but only makes clearer to us exactly what is contained in the one, final Revelation. As one writer says : ' In popular language the account of the development of Christian doctrine is as follows : There are truths which are not upon the surface of the legacy of Revelation made to the Apostles. . . . What has been said once is never unsaid, but said with more accurate definition, more completely, nearer the truth as it exists in the Divine mind ; so that we understand more clearly and can state more explicitly what before was held only implicitly.' [1]

In short, the dogmas which the Roman Church has, during the centuries, added to what she requires to be believed, were really always parts of Revelation, but they were hidden ' beneath the surface,' so that men did not realize they were there, and the Church had, by a new ' definition,' to make them aware of the fact.

What, however, is the good of such an explanation ? Let us look with some care at the actual facts, and, in order to do so, let us examine the growth of three dogmas in particular : Transubstantiation, the Immaculate Conception, and Papal Infallibility.

According to the Roman Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation, when the priest, in celebrating the Mass, utters the words, *Hoc est enim Corpus Meum* and, a little later, *Hic est enim calix Sanguinis Mei*, &c. (' For this is My Body,' and ' For this is the chalice of My Blood '), the bread

[1] Chas. Stanton Devas, *The Key to the World's Progress : Being Some Account of the Historical Significance of the Catholic Church* (Longmans, 1908), p. 67.

and wine cease to exist, and become Jesus Christ, God and Man. To quote the words of the Council of Trent, which systematized Roman doctrine in the time of the Reformation : ' By the consecration of the bread and wine, the whole substance of the bread is converted into the substance of the Body of Christ our Lord, and the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His Blood '[1] and : ' If any man shall say that the entire Christ is not contained in the venerable Sacrament of the Eucharist, under each species [i.e. both under the appearance of the bread and also under that of the wine], and under every separated particle of each species : let him be anathema.'[2]

This is not the place to go into any detailed examination of this doctrine as such. It is an attempt, on the part of mediaeval philosophers, to find a form of words justifying the crudest literal interpretation of the words of Jesus at the Last Supper : ' This is My Body,' ' This is My Blood of the New Testament.'[3] In the New Testament narratives there is not the slightest indication that these words were meant to be taken literally ; and, in order to accept the decrees of the Council of Trent, we have not only to do violence to the evidence of our senses, but also we have to believe that a plain self-contradiction may be true. The Trent decree says ' the entire Christ ' is contained in every consecrated Host, and in ' every separated particle of each.' Now, more than one Host is consecrated by a priest at each Mass ; and thousands of priests all over the world are celebrating Mass at one and the same time. Does it not follow, then, that, if the Trent decree is true, there must be millions of ' entire Christs ' existing simultaneously ? The only possible answers to this are (1) : To say it is ' a mystery ' : but that is no answer—a mystery is

[1] Council of Trent, session 13, chapter 4. (See any collection of the Trent enactments ; for example, *The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Ecumenical Council of Trent*, by Rev. J. Waterworth—London, Burns & Oates, 1848, p. 78.)

[2] Trent, session 13, canon 3 : (Waterworth, *Trent*, p. 83).

[3] Matthew, xxvi., 26, 28 ; Mark, xiv., 22–4 ; Luke, xxii., 19–20.

something we cannot understand, but which is possible ; a *self-contradiction* is not a ' mystery,' but an impossibility ; or (2) To say Christ's Body now is ' glorified,' and thus may be capable of what an ordinary body is incapable of : but this, again, is no answer—for the essence of a body is to occupy a certain portion of space, so, if the Trent decree is true, Christ's Body does not do that, and therefore it is not a real body at all ; or (3) To say that what is in the Eucharist is the ' substance ' of Christ's Body ; but this again is no answer—for the ' substance ' of a body cannot be the very opposite of the essential nature of a body ! No ; the Trent decree cannot be saved from the charge of being (besides other objections) an impossibility because it is a self-contradiction and a contradiction of other doctrines of the same Church. It is a self-contradiction because it is impossible to reconcile the doctrine that ' the entire Christ ' (' Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity ') is in each one of thousands of Hosts at once, and yet that there is only one Christ, having only one Body. Yet the Roman Church says both these things.

This doctrine of Transubstantiation grew up in the Middle Ages as a result of taking the words of Jesus crudely literally. There are passages in early Fathers of the Church which seem to give countenance to it ; but there are others which are against it. The Fathers were not systematic theologians. As Dr. James Donaldson said : ' In respect to theology there is not the slightest attempt to systematize. There is the most absolute belief in certain great truths. There is a determined, unwavering confidence in Christ as the author and finisher of their faith. But there is not the remotest desire to unravel the puzzles which afterwards beset the theological world.'[1] That remark applies to the earliest Fathers ; later the tendency set in to form elaborate theological systems. Even then, St. Augustine of Hippo, one of the greatest saints honoured by the Roman Church, could write thus of the words, ' This is My Body ' : ' " To

[1] *The Apostolical Fathers* (Macmillan, 1874), p. 62.

be carnally minded "—to understand according to the flesh —" is death." His flesh the Lord giveth us to eat, and "to understand according to the flesh is death"; while yet of His flesh He saith, that in it is life eternal. Therefore, even the flesh we must not "understand after the flesh." '[1] How can this statement be reconciled with Trent?

The doctrine of Transubstantiation was first fixed on the Roman Catholic Church as a binding dogma at the Fourth Lateran Council under Pope Innocent III in 1215. Previous to that, it was commonly held, but had not been actually defined as part of Divine Revelation. Now, I put it thus: Revelation is Revelation. A doctrine is either revealed, or it is not. If, previous to 1215, Transubstantiation could be denied, and afterwards it could not, but was imposed as an article of faith—then in 1215 there was an 'addition to Revelation.'

So also with the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. This doctrine is that the Blessed Virgin Mary, 'through the foreseen merits of her Son,' was, from the first instant of her existence, preserved from all stain of original sin. If this doctrine is a part of the Divine Revelation which the Church is bound to teach, then clearly it must always have been taught as such. The very contrary, however, is the case. To quote the German Protestant historian, Mosheim: 'About the year 1140 [a controversy arose] concerning what was called the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary. . . . St Bernard [of Clairvaux] severely censured the Canons of Lyons on account of this innovation and opposed the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin with the greatest vigour. . . . The subject was debated, on both sides, with the utmost animosity and contention of mind.'[2] The Roman Catholic *Dictionary* also says: 'St Bernard's opinion [against the doctrine] was the prevalent one before

[1] Augustine, *Homilies on St. John*, hom. 27 (Pusey's *Library of the Fathers*, 1848; Hom., vol. ii., pp. 416–421).

[2] *Ecclesiastical History* (Maclaine's translation, 1827), vol. i., pp. 299–300.

and during his own age [1091–1153]. . . . But the strongest evidence to the prevalence of the belief that the Virgin was *not* conceived without sin is supplied by Scotus [John Duns Scotus, the famous Franciscan friar and philosopher : A.D. 1265–1308]. . . . He gives his own opinion, in favour of the Immaculate Conception, with a timidity which clearly betrays his consciousness that the general opinion was on the other side.'[1]

Over four centuries later, the controversy was still the reverse of settled. As Mosheim says : 'The old debate, between the Franciscans and Dominicans, concerning the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, which was maintained by the former, and denied by the latter, gave much trouble and perplexity to the Roman Pontiffs [in the seventeenth century], and more especially to Paul V, Gregory XV, and Alexander VII. The kingdom of Spain was thrown into such combustion, and so miserably divided into factions by this controversy, about the beginning of this century, that solemn embassies were sent to Rome, both by Philip III and his successor, with a view to engage the Roman Pontiff to determine the question, or, at any rate, to put an end to the contest by a public Bull. But, notwithstanding the weighty solicitations of these monarchs, the oracle of Rome pronounced nothing but ambiguous words.'[2]

Yet, in 1854, Pope Pius IX declared the Immaculate Conception to be a part of Divine Revelation, 'most constantly to be believed by all the faithful'!—yet 'Revelation cannot be added to'!

With regard to the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Pope, a similar state of things exists. This dogma was made an article of faith at the Vatican Council in 1870, in these words : 'Therefore, adhering faithfully to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the

[1] Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, pp. 440–41.
[2] *Ecclesiastical History*, ii., 205.

Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian people, we teach and define—the sacred Council approving [*sacro approbante Concilio*]—that it is a divinely-revealed dogma that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks from the Chair [*cum ex Cathedrâ loquitur*]—that is, when, discharging the office of Pastor and Teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority he defines a doctrine concerning faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church, is, by the Divine aid promised to him in Blessed Peter, possessed of [*pollere*: "strong with"] that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed His Church to be endowed for defining doctrine concerning faith or morals: and therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are of themselves [*ex sese*], and not from the Church's consent, incapable of amendment [*non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae, irreformabiles esse*].'

This decree, of course, is worded in the highly-technical language of Roman theology, and is very involved in its phraseology; but a careful examination of it reveals some curious facts.

It was not a decree of *the Council*, but of *the Pope*. 'We define, the sacred Council approving': i.e., *the Pope* defines, the Council merely gives approval. Further on, we read that 'definitions of the Roman Pontiff' are irreformable 'of themselves, and not from the Church's consent.'

Thus, the 1870 decree on infallibility rests on the authority *not* of the Council, but of the Pope himself, for, though the Council (by a majority) 'approved,' yet the approval was unnecessary and was not the source of the decree's force. Now, what is the value of a decree of this sort? It comes to this: 'The Pope is infallible, because he says so; and he is right in saying so, for he is infallible!' The elephant stands on the tortoise, and the tortoise on —nothing!

History is full of evidence against the infallibility of the Pope. To quote a famous book written just before the

Vatican Council: 'Innocent I and Gelasius I, the former writing to the Council of Milevis, the latter in his epistle to the Bishops of Picenum, declared it to be so indispensable for infants to receive Communion, that those who die without it go straight to hell. A thousand years later the Council of Trent anathematized this doctrine. . . . But the strongest case [of Papal fallibility] occurred at the end of the ninth century, after the death of Pope Formosus, when the repeated rejections of his ordinations [of priests] threw the whole Italian Church into the greatest confusion, and produced a general uncertainty as to whether there were any valid Sacraments in Italy. . . . Popes and synods decided in glaring contradiction to one another: now for, now against, the validity of the ordinations, and it was self-evident that in Rome all sure knowledge on the doctrine of ordination was lost. . . . [Again:] In contrast to Pope Pelagius, who had declared, with the whole Eastern and Western Church, the indispensable necessity of the invocation of the Trinity [i.e. of saying the words, "*In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti*": "In the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost"] in baptisms, Nicolas I assured the Bulgarians that baptism in the name of Christ alone was quite sufficient: and thus exposed the Christians there to the danger of an invalid baptism. . . . [Again:] Stephen II (III) allowed marriage with a slave-girl to be dissolved, and a new one to be contracted, whereas all previous Popes had pronounced such marriages to be indissoluble. . . . [Again:] The Capernaite doctrine, that Christ's Body is sensibly (*sensualiter*) touched by the hands and broken by the teeth in the Eucharist—an error rejected by the whole Church, and contradicting the impassibility of His Body—was affirmed by Nicholas II at the Synod of Rome in 1059.'[1]

These are only a few out of many available evidences of Papal *fallibility*. How do Roman Catholics explain them?

[1] *The Pope and the Council*, by 'Janus' (English translation, Rivington's, London, 1870), pp. 51–55.

Whenever an erroneous decision of a Pope is put forward by critics, Roman Catholics answer, ' It was not *ex cathedrâ*.' What, then, does ' *ex cathedrâ* ' mean ? The fact is, it is impossible to say what Papal decisions do, and what do not, come under that term. Were Pope Pius IX's encyclical *Quanta Cura*, of December 8, 1864, and the *Syllabus of Modern Errors* which was appended to it—in which documents most of our modern liberties were condemned—infallible ? Were Pope Leo XIII's encyclicals, *Immortale Dei* (1885), *Libertas* (1888), and *Sapientiae* (1890)—which also contain condemnations of modern liberties—infallible ? Was his Apostolic Brief *Apostolicae Curae* (1896)—in which, ' of Our own motion and certain knowledge,' he pronounced Anglican Orders ' absolutely null and utterly void '—infallible ? The fact is, no tests can be produced by which to decide whether a Papal decision is *ex cathedrâ* or not, except a test which will either go too far or not far enough. The Papal decisions which have been made during the centuries have been so numerous that any test, of what *ex cathedrâ* is, will be found to include contradictory documents, or else to be so vague that the term *ex cathedrâ* will have no meaning at all, and thus will be useless. Can any Roman Catholic theologian produce a list of all the infallible decisions of Popes ? It is out of the question to do so.

We find, then, that the Vatican decree of 1870 (1) is a ' vicious circle ' : an elephant on a tortoise and a tortoise on nothing ; and (2) it is meaningless when analysed.

Furthermore, what of the Roman maxim that ' Revelation cannot be added to ' ? Before 1870, Papal Infallibility could be denied by any Roman Catholic without his thereby being a heretic. Indeed, so untrue is it that the 1870 decree ' adhered faithfully to the tradition handed down from the beginning of the Christian faith,' that, in fact, there was a time when the very life of the Papacy depended on principles the opposite of those of 1870.

In the Great Schism of the West (1387–1417), there were, sometimes two, sometimes three, rivals each claiming to

be the real Pope, and each excommunicating the other. ' The Holy See is the divinely appointed centre of unity to the Catholic Church, and its endurance in that character is perhaps the crowning marvel of human history ; and yet at one time the world saw for forty years the spectacle of two, and for a portion of this period of three, distinct successions of prelates engaged in bitter conflict with one another, each claiming to be the legitimate line of Roman Pontiffs, each gathering round itself a portion of the divided Christendom, and each launching out denunciations against the adherents of the other [one or] two.' [1]

How was this frightful state of affairs healed ? By the assembling of the Council of Constance in 1415, and by that Council taking the matter into its own hands. How did it get rid of the ' rival Popes ' ? Let us quote a Roman Catholic authority : ' In the fourth and fifth sessions (March 30, April 6) decrees were adopted declaring that the council, representing the Catholic Church, held its power immediately from Jesus Christ, and that every one, even the Pope himself, was bound to obey it in all that concerned the faith, the extinction of the schism, and the reform of the Church in its head and members.' [2] On the basis of these decrees, the ' rival Popes ' were got rid of and, on November 11, 1417, Cardinal Otto Colonna was elected as Pope (Martin V). The Papacy therefore absolutely *owed its restoration* to decrees making the Popes subordinate to Councils. As Addis and Arnold admit, ' unless the council could succeed in enforcing obedience to its decisions, there seemed to be no hope of restoring unity to the Church.' [3]

It comes to this : If the decrees of Constance were valid, then we have the Church contradicting itself. In 1415 the Pope is declared subordinate to the Church ; in 1870 he is not. On the other hand, if the decrees of Constance were

[1] The Rev. S. F. Smith, S.J., *The Great Schism of the West* (Catholic Truth Society), pp. 1–2.

[2] Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 226.

[3] *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 226.

not valid, what guarantee is there that Martin V, who owed his election to them, was a truly-appointed Pope? Yet, if he was not, the whole subsequent succession of the Papacy has been invalid! In any case, it was, clearly, no part of Divine Revelation, in 1415, that decisions of the Pope are independent of the consent of the Church!

Now consider another case: the 'Gallican liberties.' 'The King [of France] claimed the right of appointing to vacant Sees, and this being refused [by the Pope] he caused a series of articles to be drawn up limiting the Papal power in France.'[1] Of these articles the fourth was: 'The Pope has the principal share in questions of faith; his decrees regard all the Churches and each Church in particular; nevertheless his judgement is not irreformable, unless the consent of the Church be added.' It will be seen that this directly contradicts what was decreed at the Vatican Council later (in 1870). As Addis and Arnold say, 'It is scarcely necessary to remark that to adhere to this last proposition of the fourth article, since the promulgation of the constitution *Romanum Pontificem* at the Vatican Council, would amount to formal heresy.'[2]

Yet (though of course the Pope did not approve of the Gallican Articles), the French Church remained in full communion with Rome. Clearly, the doctrine which, in 1870, was declared to have been handed down 'from the beginning of the Christian faith,' was no part of Divine Revelation in the eighteenth century. It became so only in the nineteenth!

We have now carefully examined the development of the Papal power both in government and in doctrine. What are we to conclude?

These conclusions seem inevitable: (1) That the Papal power is a natural, largely political, and very gravely faulty development, and that its special assertions of 'Divine

[1] *The Dictionary of Religion*, edited by Rev. W. Benham (Cassell, London, 1891), p. 458.

[2] *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 377.

right ' are mistaken ; (2) That Papal Infallibility rests on bad logic and is disproved by facts ; (3) That the whole process of Roman Catholic doctrinal development is a self-contradiction : it says Revelation cannot be added to—and yet continually adds to it !

While the candid historian will recognize the greatness and religious power of the Roman Church, yet history and logic prove it to be committed to errors which, being errors, must be rejected for that reason, and which also are the source of dangerous tendencies. These errors led to exaggerated claims which cannot be accepted and with which compromise is not possible.

THE 'TEMPORAL POWER' OF THE POPES

Chapter II

THE 'TEMPORAL POWER' OF THE POPES

The previous chapter, dealing as it did with the important and complicated subject of the Papal claims in general, was longer than the present one need be. The conclusion at which we arrived was that the special claims of the Papacy are not true. The words may be quoted which *The Times* wrote of Pope Pius IX[1] and the decree of Papal Infallibility: 'When once he and his legion of theologians are out of the way, and the dust has lain a few years on this presumed masterpiece of faith and phraseology, it will have to submit to a thousand interpretations. Already it is defended and justified[2] on the ground that it says only what has been said oftentimes and, indeed, always before; and that the qualifications effectually guard it from all imputation of arrogance or fanaticism. Such a defence may answer the present purpose, but it must recoil on the document itself and on all the personages who are devoting their whole lives to the forging of these, as it appears, harmless thunders and edgeless weapons. But did Pio Nono [Pius IX], one of the divinities of the age, really do no more than preside at a manufactory of toys for children and women, meant to frighten or amuse, and warranted to do no harm? This no one really can believe. The truth lies between the two contrary suppositions. No doubt this man was earnest in his intentions, and possibly much believing as to the results. But the artillery is too high and too wide, too conjectural, too fanciful for any definite

[1] Obituary notice on Pope Pius IX; *The Times*, London, February 8, 1878.

[2] This was the argument of Cardinal Newman, in his book, *A Letter to the Duke of Norfolk.*

human aim. The career just closed has been an ostentatious performance, worthy of a dream or a stage, but without either certainty or a fair probability, or even a presentable case for its having a true basis in actual existence, or any clear proof that it is more than an elaborate theory with a view to imposing an opinion on mankind.'

We must now turn, however, to the particular examination of a special and much misunderstood part of the history and claims of the Papacy : namely, the ' temporal power.'

To begin with, this expression—' the Papal temporal power '—is a very clumsy one, and needs to be carefully defined. It has two meanings : (1) The general claim of the Papacy to be independent of, and superior to, all purely secular Governments or States, and to have a right of intervening in political matters in certain circumstances ; and (2) The special claim of the Popes to the possession of sovereignty over a territory in Italy.

Taking the first of these two meanings, let us see what is the teaching of the Roman Church about the right relationship between itself and secular Governments. We will quote Pope Leo XIII :

' Just as the end at which the Church aims is by far the noblest of ends, so is its authority the most exalted of all authority, nor can it be looked upon as inferior to the civil power, or in any manner dependent upon it.'

' No one doubts that Jesus Christ, the Founder of the Church, willed her sacred power to be distinct from the civil power, and each power to be free and unshackled in its own sphere : with this condition, however—a condition good for both, and of advantage to all men—that union and concord should be maintained between them ; and that on those questions which are, though in different ways, of common right and authority, the power to which secular matters have been entrusted should happily and becomingly depend on the other power which has in its charge the interests of heaven.'

'If the laws of the State are manifestly at variance with the Divine law, containing enactments hurtful to the Church, or, conveying injunctions adverse to the duties imposed by religion, or if they violate in the person of the Supreme Pontiff the authority of Jesus Christ, then truly, to resist becomes a positive duty, to obey, a crime.'

'In defining the limits of the obedience owed to the pastors of souls, but most of all to the authority of the Roman Pontiff, it must not be supposed that it is only to be yielded in relation to dogmas of which the obstinate denial cannot be disjoined from the crime of heresy. Nay, further, it is not enough sincerely and firmly to assent also to doctrines which, though not defined by any solemn pronouncement of the Church, are by her proposed to belief, as divinely revealed, in her common and universal teaching, and which the Vatican Council declared are to be believed "with Catholic and Divine Faith." But this likewise must be reckoned amongst the duties of Christians, that they allow themselves to be ruled and directed by the authority and leadership of bishops, and above all of the Apostolic See.'

'Justice therefore forbids, and reason itself forbids, the State to be godless; or to adopt a line of action which would end in godlessness—namely, to treat the various religions (as they call them) alike, and to bestow upon them promiscuously equal rights and privileges. Since, then, the profession of one religion is necessary in the State, that religion must be professed which alone is true' [the Pope meant, of course, Roman Catholicism].

'While not conceding any right to anything save what is true and honest, she [the Church] does not forbid public authority to tolerate what is at variance with truth and justice, for the sake of avoiding some greater evil, or of obtaining or preserving some greater good. . . . But, to judge aright, we must acknowledge that the more a State is driven to tolerate evil the further is it from perfection; and that the tolerance of evil which is dictated by political

prudence should be strictly confined to the limits which its justifying cause, the public welfare, requires.'

' Although, in the extraordinary condition of these times, the Church usually acquiesces in certain modern liberties, not because she prefers them in themselves, but because she judges it expedient to permit them, she would in happier times exercise her own liberty. . . . [Some people: ' Liberals '] oppose not the existence of the Church, nor indeed could they ; yet they despoil her of the nature and rights of a perfect society ; and maintain that it does not belong to her to legislate, to judge, or to punish, but only to exhort, to advise, and to rule her subjects in accordance with their own consent and will. By such opinion they pervert the nature of this divine society, and attenuate and narrow its authority, its office of teacher, and its whole efficiency.' [1]

In order to understand the full meaning of all this, it must be borne in mind that, in the view of the Roman Church, everything, which is opposed to her teaching, is 'at variance with truth and justice ' : is ' evil ' : is ' at variance with the Divine law ' : is ' adverse to the duties imposed by religion.' In the words of the English Roman Catholic Catechism : ' The Church cannot err in what she teaches as to faith or morals, for she is our infallible guide in both.' [2] To what sphere of life does not the term ' morals ' apply ? Thus, the Roman Church's claim of intervention is limited only by that Church's own discretion. By ' evil,' ' variance with the Divine law,' &c., she understands not merely what any civilized person would think wrong, but—*anything whatever that is opposed to Roman teaching.* Not merely murder, theft, gross vice, violations of decency, lies, and

[1] Encyclicals (1) *Immortale Dei :* 1885 ; (2) *Arcanum Divinæ :* 1880 ; (3 and 4) *Sapientiæ Christianæ :* 1890 ; (5, 6 and 7) *Libertas Præstantissimum :* 1888. (See *The Pope and the People*—Catholic Truth Society, London, 1929—pp. 50, 40, 112, 120, 83, 89–90, 90–92.)

[2] *A Catechism of Christian Doctrine, approved by the* [R.C.] *Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales* (Burns & Oates, London ; 1921 edition), question 100.

other manifest evils, but also denials of the Infallibility of the Pope, denials of Transubstantiation or the Immaculate Conception; in short, anything opposed to the Roman Church.

When this is realized, it will be seen how far-reaching is the Roman doctrine of Church and State. It comes to this: The Roman Church is above all States, and in no way depends on them; the State, while verbally acknowledged to be independent of the Roman Church, is so only on condition that it agrees with that Church or defers to it in controversies; State laws, opposed to the Roman Church, are not binding in conscience, and it is 'a crime to obey' them; Roman Catholics are bound to obey not merely the 'defined doctrines' of the Church, but also *anything that bishops command*; the State should profess Roman Catholicism, and refuse equal rights to other 'religions (as they call them)'; the Roman Church acquiesces in the State's toleration of anything opposed to Roman Catholicism, not as 'a right,' but only to avoid greater troubles; and she looks for 'happier times' when such acquiescence will not be necessary, and she will be able to use freely her 'whole efficiency,' by 'legislating, judging, and punishing.'

When the Roman Church was in the height of its power, in the Middle Ages—when it was supreme in Western Europe—this theory found its expression in, for example, the 'deposing power of the Pope.'

'During the Middle Ages,' say Addis and Arnold, 'it was held everywhere in Christian countries [i.e. in those which were subject to the Roman Church: but the Eastern Churches were not] with undoubting conviction that princes were amenable on the score of heresy to the ecclesiastical power, and that the Pope as the vicegerent of Christ could lawfully excommunicate, and after excommunication depose or procure the deposition of a sovereign who had fallen into heresy. This was no Ultramontane theory, but the common teaching of theologians everywhere.'[1]

[1] *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 263.

The most remarkable instance of the attempted exercise of this power in regard to England was the Deposing Bull (*Regnans in Excelsis*) of Pope Pius V against Queen Elizabeth in 1569. In this Bull the Pope said : ' Relying, therefore, on His [Christ's] authority, who has placed us on this supreme Seat of Justice, in the fullness of Apostolic power, we declare the said Elizabeth a heretic, and a fautor [favourer] of heretics, and that all who adhere to her in the aforesaid incur the sentence of anathema, and are cut off from the unity of the Body of Christ. Moreover, that she has forfeited her pretended title to the aforesaid kingdom, and is deprived of all dominion, dignity and privilege. We declare that nobles, subjects and peoples are free from any oath to her, and we interdict obedience to her monitions, mandates and laws. Those who do otherwise [than as the Pope thus commands] we involve in the same anathema.' [1]

This Bull, of course, failed in its purpose : for England defeated all attack, including that of the Spanish Armada ; but it is an example of the meaning of the ' deposing power of the Pope.' Such a power, clearly, makes civil government to be in constant peril, for it would subject any Government to another one outside itself.

Roman Catholics, however, now commonly say that the ' deposing power ' was merely a mediaeval thing, and is now non-existent or disused. For example, a Roman Catholic newspaper, dealing with a special inquiry on this matter, suggested that, even in the Middle Ages, it was a disputed question as to whether the deposing power's ' basis was a theological one [and thus binding as an article of faith] or whether it was a political matter, arising out of the circumstances of the mediaeval system ' ; and the paper added : ' Hence there can be no question of the exercise of any such power to-day.' [2]

[1] *The English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, by Rev. J. H. Pollen, S.J. (Longmans, 1920), pp. 150–1.

[2] *The Universe*, London, April 20, 1928 : ' Enquiry Bureau ' column.

That is very unconvincing. In mediaeval times the deposing power was no more disputed than were the claims of the Pope in general; and, as to there being 'no question of the exercise of any such power to-day,' have we not seen how Pope Leo XIII has declared that civil laws, adverse to the Church, are not binding: 'it is a duty to resist and a crime to obey'? What is that but the 'deposing power' applied to modern circumstances? In our days, kings are of little importance apart from the democracy or bureaucracy; moreover, there are many republics. There is, then, no sense in the Pope declaring a king deposed. If, however, the Pope can declare civil laws invalid, he is doing precisely what the 'deposing power' did, only in a less direct way.

As the deposing power was directed against the rulers of States, so, in the Middle Ages, the Inquisition and other methods of complete intolerance were directed against any individual persons who dissented from Roman doctrine. Again, to quote the very useful pages of Addis and Arnold: 'The duties and powers of inquisitors are minutely laid down in the canon law, it being always assumed that the civil power will favour, or can be compelled to favour, their proceedings. Thus it is laid down that they "have power to constrain all magistrates, even secular magistrates, to execute their sentences, and these must obey on pain of excommunication"; also that inquisitors in causes of heresy "can use the secular arm" [i.e. call on the civil power to help them], and that "all temporal rulers are bound to obey inquisitors in causes of faith."'[1]

It is needless to give illustrations of the frightful results of the Papal theory of Church and State in the Middle Ages. We may simply quote the words of the celebrated historian W. E. H. Lecky: 'That the Church of Rome has shed more innocent blood than any other institution that has ever existed among mankind, will be questioned by no Protestant who has a competent knowledge of history.

[1] *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 457.

The memorials, indeed, of many of her persecutions are now so scanty, that it is impossible to form a complete conception of the multitude of her victims, and it is quite certain that no powers of imagination can realize adequately their sufferings.' [1] It is obvious that the Papal system, far from having marks of special Divine appointment, was a system from the control of which the progress of civilization made a release absolutely needful.

Now let us glance briefly at the other aspect of the Pope's ' temporal power,' the aspect to which that phrase is commonly applied : his claim to be a king over territory in Italy.

We alluded, in our first chapter, to the inroads of the Goths on the falling Roman Empire in the West. We have seen, also, how much inferior, in the early Church, the power and claims of the Roman Bishops were to what they were destined to become in the Middle Ages. However, the Bishop of the ancient Imperial City on the Tiber could not but be looked on with special respect ; and, as the Empire's strength failed, he became more and more not only the recipient of appeals on Church matters, but also the possessor of wealth and political influence.

Until quite modern times, the Pope's claim to be a king in Italy was largely based on what was called ' the donation of Constantine.' ' In the Middle Ages it was long believed that the first Christian Emperor had made a solemn " Edict of Donation," conferring on the Pope, Silvester I, the city of Rome, the imperial palace there, and the " provinces, places, and cities of all Italy, and the western regions." This donation was long ago recognized as a forgery ; Muratori assigns its invention to the eighth century.'[2]

What, however, was its object ? In the year 741, Pepin, the most powerful military chief in France, asked the Pope to decide whether he or the nominal king (Childeric)

[1] *History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe* (Watts's edition, London, 1910), ii., 12.

[2] *Catholic Dictionary*, pp. 785–6.

should be recognized as King of the Franks. The legitimate kings were weak; Pepin was strong. The Pope recognized Pepin as king, and Childeric was deposed. Some eleven years later, the Pope (Stephen I) called on Pepin to bring an army to Italy to rescue the exarchate of Ravenna from the power of the conquering Lombards. And here came in the forged 'Donation of Constantine.' To quote 'Janus': 'The forgery betrayed its Roman authorship in every line; it is self-evident that a cleric of the Lateran Church was the composer. The document was obviously intended to be shown to the Frankish king, Pepin, and must have been compiled just before 754. Constantine relates in it how he served the Pope as his groom, and led his horse some distance. [Fancy *Constantine* doing *that*!] This induced Pepin to offer the Pope homage, so foreign to Frankish ideas, and the Pope told him from the first that he expected, not a gift, but restitution, from him and his Franks.'[1]

That is, the forged document, the 'Donation,' was concocted in order to deceive Pepin into giving the Pope a territory which did not belong to him! Pepin, deceived, gave to the Pope the sovereignty over the exarchate of Ravenna, and, as Addis and Arnold admit, 'this was the real beginning of the Ecclesiastical State.'

However, in fairness it must be admitted that the Papal kingship was not the first nor last monarchy to be based largely on fraud. Many powers have been so based! In the case of the Papacy, however, we are dealing with a power claiming to be of specially Divine origin. Therefore the frauds have a significance of a special kind.

Also, again, in fairness it must be admitted that a power originating largely from fraud may be used nevertheless in good ways by subsequent wielders of it. No doubt the Papal power, both in its general aspects and in its Italian monarchy, did much good in the Middle Ages. It helped to form some sort of order out of the European chaos.

[1] *The Pope and the Council*, p. 132.

Nevertheless, the evils inherent in its origin and theory were so great that they were bound to bring disaster when Europe outgrew its childhood.

'Some of the evils of the Papal Italian monarchy may be mentioned. It caused the Church to be a centre of political corruption. For example : ' On May Day,' as an eminent Roman Catholic writer records, ' [in 1044] an event to which no parallel can be found in Christian records, startled the city [Rome] and the Curia. [Pope] Benedict [IX] had sold the Papacy, for money down, to the wealthy Archpriest of St. John at the Latin Gate.'[1] Even under one of the greatest of Popes [Innocent III : 1198], ' In Rome the Pope could but look on while the nobles built or demolished the nine hundred towers from which they made war upon one another.'[2]

Thus the Papal Italian monarchy went on—a mere earthly kingship, like any other, amidst wars, intrigue, corruption —doing some good, some bad, but certainly having no signs of being of specially Divine appointment. In the last half of the nineteenth century came the end. Italy, in confusion, was longing for unity. The Papal States were in a deplorable condition. ' The Roman finances were in a state of scandalous confusion. . . . Commerce was restricted by a host of prohibitory duties, which brought in little or no revenue, and threw the whole legitimate trade of the country into the hands of the smuggler. . . . The Papal soldiers had become a byword of reproach. Education, as might be expected, was entirely in the hands of the clergy —mainly Jesuits. The administration of justice was defective in the extreme. In criminal matters the executive had a right to preside and influence the decision of the judges. . . . There were no statistics or accounts—no railways—no legal codes.'[3] There could be but one end. In September,

[1] Dr. (Canon) W. Barry, *The Papal Monarchy*, p. 185.

[2] Ibid., p. 288.

[3] *The European Revolutions of* 1848, by E. S. Cayley (Smith, Elder & Co., London, 1856), pp. 218–19.

1870, the city of Rome was made the capital of United Italy, and the States of the Church ceased to exist. The Treaty of the Lateran (1929) in no way restored them. It merely recognized the Pope as King of the Vatican Palace and grounds.

What, then, are we to conclude as to the Papal 'temporal power,' both in general and as regards its Italian territorial kingship?

As to the Papal ideal in general, it conflicts with the essence of progress, and, as to what its mediaeval supremacy led to, we need only quote an able Roman Catholic writer. When the Reformation broke out, 'The official organization of the Catholic Church,' says Mr. Hilaire Belloc, 'had been thrown suddenly into disarray. It had been caught, as they used to say of sailing ships, by a squall "all standing." It was morally very weak. There had been gross and universal corruption. . . . And the Papacy, which controlled all, was in the worst case of all.'[1]

The religious theory of the mediaeval Roman Church, in short, was inherently wrong, and bound to lead to a revolt. As for the Italian Papal local monarchy, it may have been necessary for a time, but in 1870 it had become impossible, and was for ever abolished. Whether or not it is convenient to recognize the Pope—since he is head of a great, historic, international Church—as in some semblance of a sense an independent sovereign, is purely a matter of political expedience. It should be noted, however, that Article 24 of the Lateran Treaty of June, 1929, is: 'The Holy See, in relation to the Sovereignty which belongs to it also in the International sphere, declares that it remains and will remain outside all temporal competitions between the States and International Congresses held for such objects, at least unless the contending parties both appeal to its mission of peace, reserving in every case the right to make its moral and spiritual power felt.'[2]

[1] *How the Reformation Happened* (Cape, London, 1928), p. 218.

[2] See *The Treaty of the Lateran*, by Rev. B. Williamson, pp. 49–50.

This is a very artfully worded clause. While it seems to give up the Papacy's former tendency to political intervention, it really reserves it by the references to 'the Sovereignty which belongs to it also in the International sphere,' and to 'making its moral and spiritual power felt.' However, it is for the nations to keep Papal political tendencies in check. In any case, the old States of the Church, and Papal temporal monarchy in any real sense, are finally gone.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

Chapter III

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

What, then, is the position throughout the world, at the present time, of the Church which makes claims so haughty and far-reaching as those we have been examining?

Before answering this question, it would be well to bear carefully in mind one great historic year: 1648. For a whole generation—1618 to 1648—Europe had been devastated by the Thirty Years' War. 'In 1618 a revolution broke out in Bohemia; and in 1619 James I, of England's son-in-law, Frederick V, Elector Palatine, was elected King by the revolutionary Estates of that country, in opposition to Ferdinand, who claimed to be the legitimate King, and who was himself elected Emperor, under the title of Ferdinand II, two days later. The conflict which followed the Bohemian Revolution—[a conflict] usually known as the Thirty Years' War—was partly a war of religion, partly also a war in which the Imperial authority was pitted against the territorial authority of the Princes.'[1] It was ended in 1648 by the Peace of Westphalia. What was the attitude of the Papacy to that Peace? For a generation Europe had agonized under devastation; and yet, when the horrors at length were being ended, 'On November 20, 1648, [Pope] Innocent X published the memorable Bull *Zelo domus Dei*, in which he declared the Peace of Westphalia to be "null and void, accursed and without any influence or result for the past, the present, or the future"; and he expressly added that no one, even if he had promised on oath to observe this Peace, was bound to keep the oath. The Pope

[1] Professor S. R. Gardiner, in the *Cambridge Modern History* (1904), iii., 568.

was filled with the deepest grief—"*cum intimo doloris sensu*," says the Bull—because in the treaty of peace the free exercise of religion and right of admission to offices was granted to the Protestants. By means of this Bull Rome maintained her standpoint of holding herself empowered to release men from oaths, especially of such as had been sworn to heretics. The Powers which at Münster and Osnabrück brought the Thirty Years' War to an end, when confronted with this pretended privilege, or rather this highly illegal pretension of the Roman Curia, simply disregarded it, and it was treated in just the same way by the nations, as subsequent history unfolded itself.'[1]

The Bull *Zelo*, however, should never be forgotten. It was the Papacy's unrelenting protest against the liberation of the human mind from the fetters of the Middle Ages. The Papacy would have let blood flow on and on before she would have acknowledged that liberation. That liberation, of course, was far from a perfect one at Westphalia. It gave each German prince the right to decide the religion of his subjects. ' The phrase of the Treaty of Westphalia (1648), *cujus regio ejus religio*, i.e. the religion of the prince is the religion of the land, sums up the secular reply to the ecclesiastical order.'[2] The Papacy, however, had no objection to *princes compelling their subjects' faith*. What the Papacy opposes is their doing so when they act *against Roman Catholicism*. The Westphalian Peace, imperfectly but definitely, established the right of non-Roman Christianity to exist. The Papacy solemnly showed, in a protesting Bull, that it would have preferred continued war to *that*. It does not recognize, even *now* (as we have seen in the previous chapters) that such Christianity has any right to exist ; and it hopes for ' better times.'

What, then, is the actual present position of the Roman Catholic Church throughout the world ?

[1] Dr. Moritz Brosch, in *Cambridge Modern History*, iv., 688.

[2] Rev. Bede Jarrett, O.P. [Dominican], in the *Catholic Encyclopaedia* (1911), xi., 454.

ITALY.—Ever since the collapse of the old Western Roman Empire, Italy had been (until 1870) split up into little rival States, perpetually at war with one another; and the Papal States (' States of the Church ') were amongst these elements of chaos. Let us quote the words of a Roman Catholic writer as giving concisely the plain tale: ' Prior to 1859, Italy was divided into the following states: the Kingdom of Sardinia, the Duchies of Modena, Parma, and Piacenza, the Grand Duchy of Tuscany, the Pontifical States, the Republic of San Marino, the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies and the Principality of Monaco. The Italian territories subject to foreign powers were: Corsica, belonging to France; the group of Malta, belonging to England; the Canton Ticino, belonging to Switzerland; Lombardy, Venice, Trent, Triest, and Istria, belonging to the Austrian Empire. In 1848 Piedmont went to war with Austria for Italian independence, but was defeated at Novara in 1849. Ten years later, however, Piedmont made an alliance with France, the second war of independence was declared, and Austria having been defeated at Solferino, July 20, 1859, by the Franco-Sardinian allies, Lombardy was annexed to Piedmont. In 1860 the Duchies of Modena and Parma, the Grand Duchy of Tuscany and the Romagnas (March 12), the Marches and Umbria (November 5), Naples and Sicily (October 21), were incorporated with Piedmont, and on March 17, 1861, the Parliament at Turin proclaimed the Kingdom of Italy. In 1866, by its alliance with Prussia, Italy obtained Venice; finally, on September 20, 1870, Rome, having been taken by force of arms, declared its union with the Kingdom of Italy through the plebiscite (October 2) of that year. . . . In 1871 Rome was declared the capital of the Kingdom of Italy. In the same year Pope Pius IX refused to accept the Law of Guarantees, and in 1878 [he] issued the decree " Non Expedit " against Catholic participation in elections to the Italian Chambers.'[1]

True, there was a brief period, after the election of

[1] Dr. L. Tacchi-Venturi, in *Catholic Encyclopaedia*, viii., 234.

Pius IX in 1846, when the idea was entertained that that Pope himself would head the movement for Italian freedom. As a Cardinal, he had been known for progressive views (he had been Cardinal Mastai Ferretti), and, when he was chosen to the Pontificate, 'Europe was startled with the astounding intelligence that a liberal and reforming Pope was the head of the Latin Church.'[1] It did not last long, however! The state of the Papal Monarchy was too corrupt. After vain efforts to ameliorate its condition, Pio Nono fled from Rome in 1848. Later, he returned, supported by foreign bayonets, and thus he continued—a thorough reactionary—till the fall of the Temporal Power in 1870. Since then, Church and State in Italy remained in virtual hostility till after the Great War of 1914–1918. Even as late as the pontificate of Pius X (1903–1914), although at first Church and State seemed more friendly, yet 'the situation changed rapidly for the worse, Freemasonry and anti-clericalism became rampant, and an English Jew who became Mayor of Rome took every occasion to pour forth insult and abuse against the Holy See and the Catholic religion. Socialism of an extreme type, too, had laid hold of the country, and in many parts and even in Rome itself it was unsafe for priests or students to walk about alone.'[2]

The coming of the Fascist dictatorship after the War gave the Papacy its opportunity to compromise a situation which was becoming ridiculous. It had long been obvious that the States of the Church were gone for ever: yet the Papacy went on protesting. How could so untenable a position be rectified? After long negotiations, a Treaty was concluded between the Fascist State and the Papacy.

It must clearly be understood that this Treaty—although it and the *Concordat* appended to it affected the Italian nation vitally—was arranged in utter secrecy, and the Italian people not only were not allowed any hand in it, but

[1] E. S. Cayley, *The European Revolutions of* 1848, p. 223.
[2] Rev. Benedict Williamson, *The Treaty of the Lateran*, pp. 20–21.

were not even aware that it was to be concluded, nor was any discussion of it permitted. ' While the foreign Press for a month before the signing of the Treaty had been printing more or less wildly inaccurate accounts of its nature and contents, the Italian Press preserved the most absolute silence, not printing so much as a line referring to the Roman Question.'[1] This silence—' a tribute to the efficacy of the Censorship '[2]—had the result that, even after all had been settled, ' when the Treaty would be signed, and where, and what its contents, gave rise to the most contradictory stories ; even the highest authorities were unable to give any real information.'[3]

Thus did two despotisms—a secular one and a religious one—negotiate over the vital affairs of a nation. The Treaty consisted of twenty-seven main and three supplementary articles. It recognized, on the part of Italy, the Pope as an independent sovereign over the Vatican, its grounds, and a few buildings ; on the part of the Papacy, the Italian Kingdom was acknowledged. In the supplementary articles, Italy agreed to pay the Pope an indemnity of 1,750,000,000 Italian lire.

To the Treaty was appended an Agreement—Concordat—of forty-five articles, regulating the religious affairs of Italy. It gave a position of *de jure* pre-eminence to Roman Catholicism.

However, Fascism did by no means adopt wholly the Papal ideals of Church and State. While recognizing Roman Catholicism as pre-eminent, it also recognized other religions as entitled to freedom. Signor Mussolini, speaking in the Italian House of Deputies on the new Treaty and Concordat, said : ' The Concordat assures to the Catholic Church the free exercise of its spiritual power, and confers upon it a special prestige in connexion with the fact that the Catholic religion is the official religion of the State. But the full liberty of the exercise of the other cults permitted in the State, and the equality of citizens in point of the law, no

[1] Williamson, *Treaty*, pp. 31, 32. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.

matter what religion they profess, is not in the least diminished.'[1]

This, of course, is the reverse of the *Papal* conception of things. As we have seen, that conception is that the State ought to profess Roman Catholicism because that religion 'alone is true'; and it ought to tolerate other 'religions (as they are called)' not as a right thing to do, but only as a disagreeable act of expedience, to be avoided as much as possible. Thus, the Fascist and Papal religious policies in Italy, though allied for the political interests of each, are vitally opposed in principle. Also, the Fascist conception of the State as a whole, and the Papal conception, are opposed. The Fascist theory is that the State is supreme over all; the Papal, that the State is subordinate to the Church. What will be the ultimate result? Will there be a clash in Italy? If Fascism and the Papacy do not come to a clash, will Fascism ultimately fall or disintegrate, and will the clash be between the Papacy and freedom both in State and in Church? Who can tell? The future of Italy is full of puzzles.

Other Latin Countries.—*France*, 'the eldest daughter of the Church' (so called because it was the first country to which, in early centuries, the expanding Papacy extended its jurisdiction), has always been on more or less bad terms with the Popes. It was the emissary of Philip the Fair of France who, in 1302, made the Pope—Boniface VIII—a tragic captive: an event vividly commemorated by Dante thus:

> Veggio in Alagna entrar lo fiordaliso,
> E nel vicario suo Cristo esser catto.
> Veggiolo un'altra volta esser deriso;
> Veggio rinnovellar l'aceto e il fele,
> E tra vivi ladroni essere anciso.
> Veggio il nuovo Pilato sì crudele,
> Che ciò nol sazia, ma, senza decreto,
> Porta nel tempio le cupide vele—[2]

[1] *See* Williamson, *Treaty*, p. 80.
[2] *Purgatorio*, xx., 86–93 (with Longfellow's translation).

'I see the flower-de-luce Alagna enter, and Christ in His own Vicar captive made. I see Him yet another time derided; I see renewed the vinegar and gall, and between living thieves I see him slain. I see the modern Pilate so relentless, This does not sate him, but without decretal He to the temple bears his sordid sails!'

France developed a policy of lessening to the utmost possible degree, consistent with not actual schism, the jurisdiction of the Papacy. During the Reformation France was neither wholly for one side nor wholly for the other. 'It must be noted also that there was in France a current of opinion distinct from the two warring religious elements. From the first there had been in Europe men like Erasmus, the great Dutch scholar, who felt uneasy in either camp, and refused altogether to join with Luther. In France the same middle position was held at the beginning by Rabelais, and at the end of the period by Montaigne.'[1] The result of this (and also of the forcible conversion of the Huguenots after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685) was that modern France had a very great proportion of its population either opposed, or indifferent, to religion. The Church was disestablished in 1905. After the War, diplomatic relations were resumed with the Pope; but France remains essentially an anti-clerical country in its government, though, in the population at large, we find the opposite extremes of atheism and extreme clerical devotionalism: denial of all religion, or the fervour of shrines like that of Our Lady of Lourdes.

Of all countries in Europe—except Italy—*Spain* and *Portugal* (especially Spain) bear deepest marks of the effects of the mediaeval theory of Church and State. In studying their history, we must allow for the fact that for centuries parts of Spain were ruled by the Moors, and therefore, for the native Spaniards, Roman Catholicism became a cause patriotic as much as religious. After the Moorish power

[1] Professor A. J. Grant, *A History of Europe* (Longmans, 1920), pp. 515–16.

was finally destroyed in Spain (1492), the Inquisition was set up to root out heresy, and especially to deal with Moors and Jews who, having become outwardly Christians, had afterwards fallen away from the Church or become suspect of heresy. For generations the fires of the *autos de fé* blazed ; great numbers of the ablest members of the community were expelled from the country, death being the penalty of remaining ; property was constantly menaced with confiscation ; intolerance and terror brooded over the land. As a result, Spain is the only country in Europe today where, although religious tolerance is nominally the law, yet ' public manifestations ' of any cult other than Roman Catholicism are forbidden. Moreover, even when the present partial degree of religious liberty was granted in 1876, it was enacted in the teeth of bitter opposition from the clerical party. In 1910, when the Premier, Canalejas, proposed to liberalize the law, he was bitterly fought by the Pope. At the present time, Spain, apparently lacking in capacity for free progress, stands a glaring example of the effects of centuries of obscurantism in Church and State. As to *Portugal*, her religious history has been, till recently, very similar to that of Spain, but the revolution of 1910 disestablished the Church and abolished the monarchy. Portugal now has a republic with separation of Church and State. Will Spain go a similar road ?

It is in the South American continent that the Roman Catholic Church has made its most notable conquests since the Reformation. As Macaulay said eighty-nine years ago : ' Her acquisitions in the New World have more than compensated her for what she has lost in the Old. Her spiritual ascendancy extends over the vast countries which lie between the plains of the Missouri and Cape Horn, countries which, a century hence, may not improbably contain a population as large as that which now inhabits Europe.'[1] These countries are : Colombia, Venezuela, Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, Chili, Paraguay, Bolivia, Peru,

[1] *Essay on von Ranke.*

Ecuador, and Panama. The largest of all—Brazil—was colonized by Portugal; the rest by Spain. However, it would be a mistake to look on them as solidly Roman Catholic. The country to which that description is most nearly applicable is Peru, which, in 1929, issued a Government decree forbidding any religion except Roman Catholicism to be taught in any school (even a private one) in Peru. The decree was thus: 'The establishments of teaching in which are propagated religions opposed to that of the State are realizing a work destructive to the national unity which it is incumbent upon the Government to preserve and strengthen. . . . It is decreed: (1)—In establishments of education that function in the Republic, official as well as private, there may not be taught doctrines that in any sense oppose the religion of the State. (2)—Private institutes of teaching that infringe this law will be closed.'[1] However, it is doubtful whether it will be possible to enforce this decree. As to the other South American Republics, there is, for practical purposes, religious freedom; but the predominant creed is Roman Catholicism.

What, however, of the great and strange country to the north of South America—*Mexico*? For many years the Roman Catholic Church there had been at war with the successive Republican Governments, until, under that of President Plutarco Calles in 1926–27, it seemed to become a struggle to the death. A Roman Catholic writer has expressed his view of the state of affairs thus: 'Misled by anti-Christian theories, mostly Marxian, the present rulers of Mexico are fighting against religion. . . . Mexico is losing everything. With their Christianity, which is almost gone, the Yaquis [native Mexican Indians] are losing civilization itself. In the wilder parts of Sonora, at

[1] See the *New York Herald-Tribune*, August 18, 1929. (The English *Catholic Times*, November 15, 1929, had an enthusiastic article supporting the Peruvian decree; title, 'Peru Puts her Foot Down'.)

Onabas, Tecoripa, and Baroyeca, one finds the ruins of beautiful old mission churches which once served Indian congregations whose descendants are in the army (not a school of virtue) or in American mines and factories (not schools for virtue either). Most of these Indians have reverted practically to paganism.'[1] In 1929 a compromise was entered into between Church and State in Mexico; but that country remains anti-clerical in its Government. Captain McCullagh overlooks the real root of the trouble. It is not that the rulers of Mexico are 'fighting against religion,' but that, in its Roman Catholic form, religion in Mexico has made itself indistinguishable from a retrograde tendency dangerous to progress and the State.

The United States of America.—In the New World, compare the development of the United States of the North with the Latin lands of the South! The contrast, indeed, is seen side by side! What was the sectarian war in Mexico but a natural, though tragic, reaction from undue clerical encroachments? As to the United States, Roman Catholics there are numerous (largely of Irish descent, especially in New York City), but the national population is huge. Roman Catholics are, at most, eighteen per cent., and they are so influenced—as all citizens there must be—by the American theory of entire equality of citizens as regards religion, that their political mentality differs radically from that of their co-religionists in, say, Italy or Spain. Indeed, when, previous to the Presidential Election of 1928, a Roman Catholic (Governor Alfred Smith) was a candidate—he was eventually unsuccessful—for the Presidency, he defended his political freedom from clerical control in these words: 'I believe in absolute freedom of conscience for all men, and in equality of all Churches, all sects, and all beliefs before the law as a matter of right and not as a matter of favour.'[2] This opinion is,

[1] Captain F. McCullagh, *Red Mexico* (Carrier & Co., New York and London, 1928), pp. 405–6.

[2] *The Atlantic Monthly* (Boston, U.S.A.), May, 1927, p. 728.

it is needless to say, directly opposed to the uniform and consistent doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church: as given, for example, in encyclicals of Leo XIII which we have already quoted. Indeed, Governor Smith's opinion is a 'modern error,' condemned by the Papacy. In 1864 Pope Pius IX issued, as an appendix to his encyclical *Quanta Cura*, a *Syllabus of the Principal Errors of Our Time.* Some Roman Catholics maintain that that Syllabus is an infallible document; and, in any case, as Addis and Arnold admit, 'all Catholics are at one concerning the doctrinal authority of the documents [Papal encyclicals] from which the Syllabus is drawn.'[1] In Proposition seventy-nine, the Pope condemned the opinion of 'Modern Liberalism' which holds that 'it is false that the civil liberty of every mode of worship, and the full power given to all of overtly and publicly manifesting their opinions and their ideas, conduce more easily to corrupt the morals and minds of the people, and to the propagation of the pest of indifferentism (*indifferentismi pestem*).' Thus, Governor Smith's theory of 'absolute freedom . . . as a matter of right,' is, in the view of his Church, a 'modern error,' leading to a 'pest.' Is it not clear that the religion of United States Roman Catholics is in direct conflict, in principle, with the Constitution of their country? If there is in the United States at present relatively little grave conflict between Protestants and Roman Catholics, that fact is due to (1) the numerical inferiority of the latter, and (2) the fact that the Papal and United States conceptions of the State are so diametrically opposed that the clerical power dare not raise the question. Yet that diametrical opposition always exists beneath the surface.

Germanic European Countries.—During the Middle Ages there was constantly-recurring strife between the old 'Holy Roman Empire' and the Papacy. When the great Hildebrand (Pope Gregory VII—1073–1086) defied both the turbulent Roman bandit-nobles and the German Emperor,

[1] *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 800.

and reformed the Papacy, Rome ' was henceforth divided for centuries into an Imperial and a papal party.'[1] It was in Germany that, headed by Luther, the Reformation broke out. The Thirty Years' War ended (1648) in a ' draw ' : neither the Protestants nor the Roman Catholics had attained complete victory ; but the Middle Ages were over —the Papacy would never dominate politics again. The Austrian, or South-East German, territories adhered to Roman Catholicism ; Saxony, Prussia, and other more northerly districts, to Protestantism. In our own times, German Catholicism has developed a type of its own. It is learned : but keenly loyal to the Papacy. At the Vatican Council of 1870, the German bishops were opposed to the policy of declaring Papal Infallibility an article of faith ; but, when the decree was passed, they all acquiesced. Dr. Döllinger, who refused so to do, was not a bishop. Soon after this, the Prussian Government entered on the *Kulturkampf* (' Culture-war ') : an effort to subordinate the Roman Catholic Church to the State. It continued till, after the accession of Pope Leo XIII, a compromise was arrived at. Ever since then, the Roman Catholics of Germany (about one-third of the population) have exercised great power, and, through *das Centrum* (' the Centre ' : a political party mainly composed of Roman Catholics) has frequently been the dominating power in the State, by holding ' the balance of votes.' In 1929 a Concordat, regulating the affairs of the Roman Catholic Church in Germany, was concluded between the Reich and the Papacy.

As to AUSTRIA, history has seldom seen, in modern times (except for Spain) so remarkable a decline. In the time of the Reformation she was a dominant power over Europe ; but, in modern times, she became more and more inferior to Protestant Prussia. True, after the Reformation, though Austria remained Roman Catholic, progressive tendencies

[1] William Miller, *Mediaeval Rome* (*Story of the Nations* series, Unwin, London, 1904), p. 7.

showed themselves at times: and of that fact certain Jesuit writers are resentful—for example, one able American Jesuit writes: 'Joseph I of Portugal, Charles III of Spain, and Joseph II of Austria, were all of them absolutely in the power of Voltairean ministers like Pombal, de Choiseul, Aranda, Tanucci and Kaunitz, who were in league, not only to destroy the Jesuits, but to wreck the Church.'[1] Joseph II of Austria—who succeeded his mother, Maria Theresa, in 1780—aimed simply at consolidating his dominions and extending education and religious freedom. 'His insistence on religious toleration, and his opening of education to laymen, which are amongst the best of his proposed reforms, were those which aroused most hostility.'[2] Joseph II's plans met with the relentless opposition of the clericals; there was even a rising in Belgium (then part of the Austrian Empire). The plans failed, and Austria reverted to the religious conservatism which characterized her till the twentieth century. The Austrian Emperor was also Apostolic King of Hungary, and the reactionary policy extended to that country also and to the various territories united to the heterogeneous Empire. After the war of 1914–1918 that whole Empire was split up. A conservative dictatorship exists in Hungary. It is true that Hungary complains of grave injustice in the Peace Treaties after the Great War. 'In their terms,' says Count Albert Apponyi, 'millions of men would be driven from one allegiance to another, without being consulted as to their wishes.'[3] However, the new States were formed, justly or unjustly, and Hungary fell back on a dictatorial Regency and a Roman Catholic reaction in religion, while Austria, now a small State, is torn with the rivalries of clericals and Socialists.

One of the new States formed, in 1919, out of the former

[1] Rev. T. J. Campbell, S.J., *The Jesuits* (New York, 1921), p. 421.

[2] Prof. A. J. Grant, *History of Europe*, p. 643.

[3] *The Peace Treaty proposed to Hungary* (Pfeifer, Budapest, 1920), p. 7.

Austrian Empire, is Czecho-Slovakia (Bohemia). One of its heroes is John Huss, who was burnt by the Council of Constance ; and it may here be mentioned that, in 1925 and 1926, the Papacy vehemently protested against the Czecho-Slovakian Government's participating in a national festival to Huss. Thus clerical-Papalism never forgives !

Another country 'liberated' by the 1919 Peace was *Poland*, formerly divided amongst Austria, Russia, and Germany. Its subsequent history has been stormy. Roman Catholicism is the dominant religion, and is strongly Ultramontane ; but Judaism and Greek Orthodoxy also are powerful.

BELGIUM is frequently quoted by Roman Catholics as a glorious example of the beneficent influence of that religion. However, it must be remembered that Belgium, by her geographical position, is surrounded by non-Roman influences on all sides. Moreover, her Constitution, establishing religious liberty was—so far as that liberty is concerned—formed in the teeth of bitter opposition from the Roman Catholic Church. When, after the fall of Napoleon in 1815, the States-General of the United Netherlands (then including Belgium) legalized religious freedom, the Belgian prelates vigorously protested, saying : 'We are bound, Sire, incessantly to preserve the people entrusted to our care from the doctrines which are in opposition to those of the Catholic Church. We could not release ourselves from this obligation without violating our most sacred duties ; and if your Majesty, by virtue of a fundamental law, should protect in these provinces the public profession and spreading of these doctrines, we should be in formal opposition to the laws of the State.' [1] Notwithstanding this, the policy of liberty was persisted in, and continued when Belgium, by separation from Holland, became, in 1830, an independent Kingdom.

As to HOLLAND, its Constitution, and the majority of its

[1] See *The Annual Register for* 1815 (London, 1824 edition), p. '98.' (British Museum Reading Room edition, part 1, pp. 97–99.).

people, are Protestant ; but Roman Catholics form about a third of the people, and are very compact and energetic, their political action being largely guided by their Bishops.

The British Empire.—With regard to Roman Catholicism in the British Commonwealth of Nations and dependencies, a special section of this book deals with Great Britain, which therefore here may be passed over.

As to *Ireland,* the history is tragic but simple in its outlines. The Irish people adhered to Roman Catholicism when the Reformation broke out. The English Government, by a terrible series of penal laws, tried to stamp out the old faith ; but the only result was to make the Irish cling to it the more tenaciously. In 1829 the last of the penal laws were repealed ; but, thereafter, a fresh struggle went on, the Irish people desiring a Parliament of their own as against the Union Act which took it from them in 1801. In 1921 they attained their object ; the Irish Free State was set up : but seven counties of Ulster were excluded from it. In Ireland, then, there are two States : the Irish Free State (Gaelic and Roman Catholic in ideals and, so far as possible, in practice), and predominantly Protestant Ulster.

Malta (taken over after the Napoleonic wars) is professedly Roman Catholic in religion ; but modern progress has affected it, of late years, very greatly, and the clerical control is not what it was.

Canada has over a third of its population Roman Catholic : chiefly in French Canada, but also, to a lesser extent, in other districts. The case of French Canada is peculiar. When it was annexed to the British dominions in 1759, the annexation was accompanied with promises which the Quebec priesthood interpreted as guaranteeing the continuance of Roman Catholicism as the established Church. So tenacious is their hold over French Canada that such establishment does, for all practical purposes, now exist there : and, moreover, in a form more rigid than in many definitely ' Catholic ' countries. To quote an able writer : ' The practical application of canon law [as, in Quebec, that

Roman Church-law is applied] is to deny to those affected by it the benefits of British law—freedom of speech and of the press vanishes, statutes are superseded by canons, our highest Parliament denied the right to regulate so vital a concern to society at large as marriage, and allegiance to the State superseded by obedience to a caste of men who claim to be imbued with a divine essence which places them above criticism and makes questioning of their acts sacrilege. Is the demand, that there shall be only one law in Canada, and that British, unreasonable? A few years ago Canon Law had no civil force; it is now superior to the King's courts.'[1] This may seem an exaggerated statement, but it is quite true that, in French Canada, Roman Canon Law is enforced to an extent found in few other places. In regard to matrimony, for instance, 'The Ecclesiastical Courts of the province of Quebec have ruled that mixed marriages [i.e., between a Roman Catholic and a person not of that faith] can be tolerated only when they are solemnized by Roman Catholic clergy. A number of marriages have been annulled for this reason by the Ecclesiastical Court, and Quebec courts of law have upheld the decision under the civil code, which differs in Quebec from the rest of Canada.'[2] However, in 1929, a case (Beauvais *v.* McComber) was taken to the Quebec Supreme Court, and 'the presiding judge, Mr. Justice E. F. Surveyer, ruled that there was nothing in the Code Civile of Quebec that rendered null a marriage between Catholic and Protestant by a cleric other than a Catholic priest.'[3] Although, however, there seems some limit to the power of Roman Canon Law in French Canada, that power is enormous. It must also be remembered that Roman Catholicism grows in the whole of Canada more rapidly than does the general population.

In *Australia* Roman Catholics form about one in three of the population, and exert great political influence by

[1] *The Tragedy of Quebec*, by Robert Sellar (Ontario Press, Toronto, 1916), p. 255.

[2] *The Glasgow Herald*, October 15, 1929. [3] Ibid.

reason of their dominance over the Labour Party in Parliament. In *New Zealand* they are a less proportion of the people, but are controversially aggressive.

In *South Africa* Roman Catholicism is weak, not even having a regular hierarchy of Bishops, but only Vicars-Apostolic. In *India* it has regular Bishops, and the total of its adherents (a large proportion of whom, however, are pariahs, or 'outcastes') comprise nearly half the Christians of the sub-continent.

Foreign Missions.—Macaulay, three generations ago, wrote thus of Protestantism and Roman Catholicism as regards missionary effort: 'The Reformed Churches were mere national Churches. The Church of England existed for England alone. It was an institution as purely local as the Court of Common Pleas, and was utterly without any machinery for foreign operations. The Church of Scotland, in the same manner, existed for Scotland alone. The operations of the [Roman] Catholic Church, on the other hand, took in the whole world.'[1]

This, even when it was written, was a shallow statement. When the Reformed Churches became such—when, that is, their members were newly separated from Rome—how could they rival the world-wide activities of the ancient Papacy? Since then, Protestant missions have extended all over the world. However, it remains true that the Roman Catholic Church carries on missionary effort with immense energy in nearly all lands. The Congregation of Propaganda (*Congregatio de Propaganda Fide*) was established by Pope Gregory XV in 1622 'to guard, direct, and promote the foreign missions. Among other countries subject to its control were the British Isles, North America (except Mexico), Australasia, and the East and West Indies. By the Constitution *Sapienti Consilio* (June 29, 1908) this jurisdiction has been considerably restricted. The British Isles, North America, and certain other non-Catholic countries, are now under the Congregation of the Council;

[1] *Essay on von Ranke.*

that is, they are now under the normal system of Church government.'[1] The Congregation of Propaganda, even in its 'restricted' activities, has, however, an enormous field. Roman Catholic missionaries work in China, Japan (where Pope Leo XIII established a hierarchy of Bishops in 1891), in India, in Oceania, in Africa, in North America (amongst the Red Indians), in Burmah; indeed, in any possible territory. Amongst the keenest of the missionaries are the Jesuits—of whom one of their number says: 'Besides its regularly established houses the Society has missions scattered throughout the world. Thus, in Europe its missionaries are to be found in Albania; in Asia, they are working in Armenia, Syria, Ceylon, Assam, Bengal, Bombay Poona, Goa, Madura, Bangalore, Japan, Canton, Nankin, and South East Tche-ly. In Africa, they are in Egypt, Cape Colony, Zambesi, Rhodesia, Belgian Congo, and Madagascar, Mauritius and Réunion; in America, they are working in Jamaica and among the Indians of Alaska, Canada, South Dakota, the Rocky Mountains, the Pimeria, and Guiana; finally in Oceania, they are toiling in Celebes, Flores, Java, and the Philippines.'[2] It must be remembered that the Society of Jesus is *only one* of the Roman Catholic societies engaged in foreign missions.

The Eastern Churches.—Ever since the definite separation of the Greek and Latin Churches in the eleventh century, the Papacy has never ceased its efforts to extend its power so as to gain control over them or gain converts from them. At the Council of Florence (1439), the Greek delegates—in fear of the Turkish menace, and desiring Western aid, agreed to a—carefully qualified—recognition of the Papal Supremacy; but their act was repudiated by their Churches, which remain apart from Rome. A number of small groups of Easterns, however, are united to Rome (some of them having become so in modern times). These 'United Greeks' are: the Melchites (descendants of those

[1] Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 699.
[2] Rev. T. J. Campbell, S.J., *The Jesuits*, pp. 929–30.

who joined into communion with the Papacy in 1686); Ruthenians (converts from the Russian Church); Greek Catholics of Italy; Greco-Roumanians. The Roman Church has a special Congregation to promote its propaganda amongst the Churches of Eastern Europe.

We have now taken as comprehensive a survey as brief space will allow of the Roman Catholic Church's activities throughout the modern world. It will be seen that, diminished though its power is as a result of the Reformation, that power is still mighty. All the same, there is a vital difference between that power now and in the Middle Ages. In those ages, States obeyed, or were largely dominated by, the clerical power. Now, that power is subordinate to States; though in theory it retains its old claims. In concluding this section, we will glance at one of the gravest problems now facing the Roman Church: its struggle with modern knowledge.

It is true that enthusiastic advocates of Roman Catholicism assert that there is no conflict between modern knowledge and Roman Catholicism. Indeed, Mr. Hilaire Belloc goes so far as to say: 'There continues, of course, a certain amount of brawling against the Faith on the Historical side. . . . But . . . serious history is ceasing to oppose us.'[1] Such a statement is merely insolent, since it implies that all historians who oppose Roman Catholicism are mere brawlers. A man who can say that simply casts doubt on the ability of the school, to which he himself belongs, to produce a sound intellectual outlook.

The fact is, the Roman Church is opposed in principle to the basic principle of modern science. The Roman Church upholds the Index of Prohibited Books, by which 'books condemned by the Apostolic See are to be considered forbidden throughout the entire world; and translations of them are likewise to be considered forbidden.'[2] Amongst

[1] *Survivals and New Arrivals* (1929), p. 109.

[2] *A Commentary on the Present Index Legislation*, by Rev. T. Hurley, of Maynooth, Ireland (Dublin, 1907), p. 236.

books so condemned, besides any translations of the Bible by 'non-Catholics,'[1] are 'books that detract God, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Saints, the Church, the Sacraments, or the Apostolic See; books that give erroneous ideas of the nature or extent of the Divine inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures: books that assail, *data opera*, the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, the clerical or the religious states.'[2] In short, any book criticizing Rome, or the Roman doctrine or priesthood, must not be read. To enforce the *Index*, the policy of secret denunciation is encouraged: 'All Catholics, and especially those who excel in learning, are expected to denounce bad and dangerous books to their bishops, or to the Apostolic See'[3]; and, 'The denouncers are not to be afraid that their names will be divulged; for the members of the Congregation are strictly bound to keep them a dead secret.'[4]

In his encyclical *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* (September 8, 1907) against Modernism, Pope Pius X, stating what the 'remedial measures' should be, ordained[5] that 'scholastic philosophy [the philosophy of the mediaeval Schoolmen] be made the basis of the sacred sciences'; that any one in any way opposed to the traditional ways 'is to be excluded without compunction' from teaching offices; that the Bishops must 'prevent from being read when published, and hinder their publication when they have not,' any writers' works so opposed; that the ecclesiastical Censorship should be tightened up; that congresses of priests, to discuss intellectual problems, are to be discouraged; that Diocesan Vigilance Committees are to be set up; and that 'the Bishops of all dioceses, a year after the publication of these letters [i.e., this Encyclical] and every three years thence-

[1] *A Commentary on the Present Index Legislation*, by Rev. T. Hurley, of Maynooth, Ireland (Dublin, 1907), p. 67.
[2] Ibid., pp. 89–104. [3] Ibid., p. 176. [4] Ibid., p. 178.
[5] Encyclical *Pascendi*, English translation, 'official, published by authority by Burns & Oates, London,' 1907, pp. 57, 59, 62, 64, 65, 68.

forward, furnish the Holy See with a diligent and sworn report on the things which have been decreed in this Our Letter.' Pius X's encyclical on Modernism has been confirmed by both his successors : Benedict XV, encyclical *Ad Beatissimi*, November 1, 1917, and Pius XI, encyclical *Ubi Arcano Dei*, December 23, 1922.[1]

How can it be said, then, that the Roman Church and modern knowledge are not opposed ? The Roman Church believes in strict censorship and curtailment of free study. Science relies on open statement and full free study. The two are diametrically opposed. This clear conflict was bound to develop from the theories which dominated Europe in the Middle Ages ; for those theories were based on an excessively rigid idea of the nature of the human mind. A revolt therefrom was sure to occur at some period, and to produce a permanent conflict (so long as the Latin Church retains its rigid conceptions) : as a logical consequence of antagonism between that rigidity and the free will of men.

In this chapter, of course, it has been possible only to give the most cursory glance at the world-wide activities of the Roman Catholic Church. Perhaps in another book it may be done with some adequacy ; but here we are concerned only with gaining a general impression—though an accurate one. Neither is there any desire to ignore the *noble* aspects of the subject. So great and ancient a Church has not existed wholly as a vanity. In countless, humble homes and hearts its devotions are treasured as guides to God, and the holy elements amid the exaggerations produce holy fruit in lives unknown on the broad stage of the world. As Paley said nearly a century and a half ago : ' Religion operates most upon those of whom history knows the least ; upon fathers and mothers in their families . . . It cannot, therefore, be thought strange that this influence should elude the grasp and touch of public history : for what is

[1] See *The Pope and the People* (Catholic Truth Society, London, 1929), pp. 214, 249.

public history but a register of the successes and disappointments, the vices, the follies, and the quarrels, of those who engage in contentions for power?'[1] Many a holy life is led, unknown to public fame, in every Church: and in the Latin as in others. It is not the elements of holiness with which there is ground of quarrel, but the secular autocracy. In all the countries we have mentioned, therefore, we must think of the Roman Catholic religion as a mingling of truth and error, the truth working beneficently, but the error operating to spoil the truth. No doubt that is true also of other creeds, but the special trouble in the case of the Roman Church is the claim to infallibility, which produces an autocratic system which allows no choice save between itself and entire unbelief. A very interesting book has been issued recently in France by a Jesuit writer.[2] It pictures France as a country divided between atheism and a retreating orthodoxy. What do such facts show?

No one will deny the great and in many ways noble part which the Roman Church has taken—is taking—in the world. Even in his encyclical on Modernism, Pius X upheld much that is essential to faith, and condemned much that deserved to be condemned. Is autocracy—is obscurantism—the right way to promote truth, however? No!—and of the Roman Church we must say, in the words of Bishop Gore: 'We would fain not fall short of what is fitting in our veneration of the greatest of Christian patriarchates. But no such veneration can justify us in assenting to *any* claims she likes to make.'[3]

[1] *Evidences of Christianity*, part 3, chap. 7.
[2] Rev. P. Croizier, S.J., *Pour Faire l'Avenir* (Paris, 1929).
[3] *Roman Catholic Claims* (1909 edition), p. 105.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN GREAT BRITAIN

Chapter IV

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN GREAT BRITAIN

At their meeting on May 2, 1869, the Roman Catholic Archbishop and Bishops in England, by a special resolution, ordered that 'public as well as private prayers and intercessions be offered up constantly to God for the conversion of England,' and that 'the Exposition and Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament on the second Sunday of every month shall be for this intention.' Cardinal Nicholas Wiseman, the first Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster, had recently died; but he had left a special prayer he had composed for such occasions, beseeching God through 'the intercession of Thy Saints' to 'save Thy people, and bless Thine inheritance,' by 'delivering the ignorant from being misled by false teachers,' and causing the nation to be 'restored to that unity of mind, steadiness of faith, and peace of conscience, which is nowhere to be sought but in the communion of Thy Church.' There is a special 'Litany of Intercession for England,' and in it it is prayed: 'Lord, have mercy on us . . . Christ, have mercy on us . . . Lord, have mercy on us . . . Holy Mary, Queen of Angels, whose powerful intercession destroyeth all heresies, pray for England . . . St. Michael, Prince of the Church . . . St. Gabriel . . . St. Raphael . . . All ye holy angels and blessed spirits of heaven . . . St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles . . . All ye holy Apostles and Evangelists . . . St. George, our principal patron . . . All ye holy martyrs of this nation . . . All ye holy Saints of all places . . . pray for England. . . . Be merciful, O Lord, and spare us . . . From trusting presumptuously to

private opinion, and contemning the authority of Thy Church . . . Deliver England, O Lord . . . That it may please Thee to hasten the conversion of this our country, and reunite it to the ancient Faith and communion of Thy Church . . . We beseech Thee, hear us.'[1]

Thus it will be seen that the ' conversion of England ' to Roman Catholicism is not merely the enthusiastic dream of individuals, but it is an aim most solemnly consecrated, for sixty years past, by the most intense prayer and devotion sanctioned by special liturgical observances.

This is not the place to go over afresh the oft-told story of the Reformation ; so a few brief observations will suffice. As we have seen, during the Middle Ages the Papacy asserted the most far-reaching claims both in religion and in politics. The clash, between those claims and the growing spirit of European nationalism, produced the separations known as the Reformation. The English Church was reformed, though on a historical basis which retained its continuity with the past. The Scottish Reformation took a more thorough line, Presbyterianism being established. The Irish people remained attached to the unreformed faith. Pope Pius V declared Queen Elizabeth of England deposed. A war to the death then went on, involving plots, and attempts at invasion of England, by the Roman Catholics here and the Papacy and Spain abroad. A terrible code of penal laws was enacted against Roman Catholics here and in Ireland. For 270 years those laws existed, but were finally repealed in 1829. By that time the Roman Catholics in England were a mere remnant of the population. ' In England the Catholics [were] a small remnant, grouped for the most part around certain old families who provide[d] chapels in their own mansions for the very few Catholics of the neighbourhood.'[2] In Scotland the Roman

[1] See *The Garden of the Soul*, a popular Roman Catholic prayer-book (London, Burns & Oates ; 1914), pp. 242–6.

[2] Denis Gwynn, *The Struggle for Catholic Emancipation* (Longmans, London, 1928), p. 3.

Catholics were equally weak ; but in Ireland they formed the great majority of the people.

Then came the Anglo-Catholic 'Oxford Movement,' arousing interest in, and controversy about, the Roman Catholic Church. A number of prominent Church of England clergy and laity joined that Church : John Henry (afterwards Cardinal) Newman being one. In 1846 the terrible Irish Famine caused a large emigration of poor Irish into English cities, thus increasing largely the numerical, but not the financial, strength of the Roman communion here. In 1850 Pope Pius IX established in England a hierarchy of Bishops, headed by Cardinal Wiseman as Archbishop of Westminster. Even after the setting up of this hierarchy, however, the English Roman Catholic clergy were regarded, in canon law, as ' missionary ' ; that is, as not having the ordinary status of parish priests, but as coming under the oversight of the Congregation of Propaganda at Rome. This continued until, by the Constitution *Sapienti Consilio* of Pius X in 1908, practically the full rules of regular canon law were applied to England.

How have things developed in the working ? Of course, Roman Catholicism experiences an ebb and flow of members : loss by ' leakage,' gain by conversions. With regard to conversions, the gross annual totals, as given in *The Catholic Directory*, seem large : round about 11,000 yearly ; but they require analysis—and in any case are but .03 of the total population of the country. Of the genuineness of the figures there can, of course, be no doubt. Every convert to Roman Catholicism has to be formally received after a course of doctrinal instruction, and the reception must be notified to the Bishop on a form specially kept for that purpose. How many of the converts, however, remain such for life ? There are no means of ascertaining the answer to this ; but it is certain that the Roman Catholic population of England does not increase as it should do if, to the ' natural increase ' of those already members, were added the converts.

Even, however, if numerical growth, in proportion to the general population, is small, if any, yet the same cannot be said of the increase of the Roman Catholic Church here in organization, influence, and ecclesiastical property.

Cardinal Wiseman's task, when in 1850 he became first Archbishop of Westminster, was to begin building up a Church out of practically nothing. His successor (Cardinal Manning) initiated an era of definitely aggressive progress in many departments. He turned his attention especially to providing schools for the Roman Catholic poor. Since his time, an elementary school has been regarded as a necessity for the proper constitution of a Roman Catholic parish. Manning aimed also at providing a Roman Catholic University, and a college was opened at Kensington. It was a failure, and, soon after, the Church ban was raised which had forbidden Roman Catholics to go to the ordinary Roman Catholic universities. The policy in our own day is to utilize those universities as much as possible.

Herbert Vaughan, a member of the old Roman Catholic (and, at one time, Jacobite) family of the Vaughans, of Courtfield, Ross, Herefordshire, succeeded Manning in 1892. He had been Roman Catholic Bishop of Salford, and, in that capacity, had devoted special attention to the education of the Roman Catholic poor so as to ' stem the leakage.' He ordered a house-to-house census to be made by his clergy. The result was to reveal that the extent of the ' leakage ' was indeed enormous.

When Bishop Vaughan became Archbishop of Westminster, he set about building the great Cathedral for which Manning had secured the site there. In June, 1895, he laid the foundation-stone, and he lived long enough to see the Cathedral sufficiently built to be opened for public worship. He died in June, 1903, and was succeeded by Francis Bourne, then Roman Catholic Bishop of Southwark.

It would be invidious to estimate—even were the materials fully available—the results of the episcopate of a prelate who is still with us ; but it may be acknowledged

—even by those of us who have no admiration for the inflexibilities of Ultramontane ecclesiastical politics—that, during the episcopate of Archbishop (afterwards also Cardinal) Bourne, Roman Catholicism in England has gained influence it never had before.

The Roman Catholic Church in this country is essentially, and even passionately, propagandist. As we have seen, its aim is to 'convert England.' Let us glance, then, at some of the organizations which are carrying on its work.

In the eighteen-seventies it occurred to some zealous Roman Catholic propagandists to imitate the example of Newman's *Tracts for the Times* and to adapt that idea to Roman Catholic purposes. 'A movement which began with the *Tracts for the Times* was not likely to abandon what had proved so successful a method of propaganda. . . . Some at least of these [converts to Rome] were struck by the absence of any such organized output of literature on the part of the Church they had joined.'[1] On November 5, 1884, at the house of Lady Herbert of Lea, a meeting was held—Bishop (afterwards Cardinal Archbishop) Vaughan presiding—at which was inaugurated the Catholic Truth Society for spreading cheap but well-written booklets in defence of Roman Catholicism. The inspiring spirits were Mr. James Britten (a convert from the Church of England) and the Rev. Father Cologan. The C.T.S. devoted its energies chiefly to issuing penny tracts on historical, doctrinal, and devotional subjects; and these supplied to free-lance controversialists an armoury of arguments which were (and are) constantly reproduced in discussions in 'local papers.' After the War of 1914–1918, the C.T.S. was (rather against the will of Mr. Britten) reorganized on a wider basis. One of the means of propaganda which it had used, and still increasingly uses, is the setting up of little bookstands, for its literature, in the porches of Roman Catholic churches.

[1] James Britten, *The Catholic Truth Society: Its Origin, &c.* (C.T.S., London), p. 15.

Another popular organization founded by a convert from the Church of England is the 'Guild of Our Lady of Ransom for the Conversion of England.' It was begun by the Rev. Philip Fletcher, fifth son of Sir H. Fletcher, Bart. Father Fletcher had been a Church of England curate (St. Bartholomew's, Brighton), but joined the Roman communion in 1878. Nine years later he, in co-operation with Mr. Lister Drummond (also a convert from the Church of England) founded the Ransom Guild. 'I was proposed and accepted as the master of the guild, Mr. Drummond the secretary and Mr. Rimmel the treasurer. . . . We were out for the redemption of captives from heresy; also of those in danger of apostasy, and we added the forgotten dead in the captivity of purgatory. Holy Mass, prayer and work, were our weapons. . . . The Ransomers of the nineteenth century divided themselves into three kinds: (1) White Cross—Priests who said Mass for our Intentions; (2) Red Cross—lay-people who worked as well as prayed; and (3) Blue Cross, who only prayed. These three colours we took from the old Trinitarians [a twelfth-century semi-monastic Order for redeeming captives from the Saracens], who wore a red and blue cross on their white habit. The date of the guild's formation was November 29, 1887.'[1] A main feature of its activities was organizing outdoor processions; but also it gave lectures in parks. An organization associated with the Ransom Guild is the Converts' Aid Society, for giving financial and other assistance to ministers of other Churches who join the Roman communion. 'His Eminence Cardinal Bourne,' says Mr. F. W. Chambers, the Secretary of this Society, 'has urged Catholics to place the Society in such a position that it may be enabled to meet the calls that will inevitably be made upon it in the near future. His Holiness Pope Leo XIII, who founded the Society in 1896 [in anticipation of the many converts who, however, never

[1] *Recollections of a Ransomer*, by Rev Philip Fletcher (London, Sands & Co., 1928), pp. 55–6.

came after that Pope condemned Anglican Ordinations], appealed to Catholics to raise a considerable sum for convert ministers.'[1] If such a Society were formed by Protestants for converts from Roman Catholicism, Roman Catholics of course would deride it as ' proselytizing souperism ' !

The Catholic Reading Guild is a comparatively small body which takes as its motto ' the conversion of England by books.' It was founded about twenty-eight years ago, but nearly collapsed during the Great War period. It was reorganized, however, by a lay convert, a clever public speaker, Mr. George E. J. Coldwell. Its work is mainly that of a library. ' The largest portion of its work consists in lending books by Catholic authors at the very nominal sum of one penny per week. The open shelves invite the reader to select freely without interference the food that possesses the most attraction for the particular object of the reader ; and the extent to which the books are used is shown in the following table : Year 1918 : Books borrowed, 5,386 ; 1919—8,358 ; 1920—7,921 ; 1921—5,671 ; 1922—5,025 ; 1923—4,942 ; 1924—4,643 ; 1925—5,255 ; 1926—5,255 ; 1927—4,653 ; 1928—4,639 ; [total]—11 years : 61,748 ; and this total does not include books that are sent to postal subscribers or reading circles.'[2] The Guild also answers ' inquiries concerning the Catholic Faith.' Whilst I was a member of its executive I formed a favourable opinion of it ; but of course it is subject—as are all Roman Catholics—to the canon law of ' prohibited books.'

The Catholic Missionary Society is a community of secular priests living in community and devoting their energies to giving lectures to ' non-Catholics.' Its president is the Rev. Herbert Vaughan, a nephew of the late Cardinal.

[1] Letter of Appeal, November 5, 1929.

[2] Pamphlet : *A Contribution to the Catholic Emancipation Centenary, 1929, from the Catholic Reading Guild* (C.R.G., 1929), p. 8. (Note.—The Guild seems not to believe in helping British unemployment ; the pamphlet is ' printed by the Gruuthuuse Press, Bruges, Belgium.')

The present Roman Catholic Archbishop of Liverpool (Dr. Richard Downey) formerly was one of its priests. It publishes a monthly magazine, *The Catholic Gazette*, and also largely controls the weekly paper, *The Catholic Times*. In 1917 *The Catholic Gazette*, then called *The Missionary Gazette*, was a very little-read paper, but, on my suggesting a change of title, its position improved. From then till 1925 I was one of its most constant writers ; but I regret to say that not only have I received no sign of gratitude or appreciation, but I was at once boycotted when I began to feel theological doubts as to the Roman Catholic position. I may add that several former workers for this Society—including one very able priest, the Rev. F. Aveling—have left the Roman Catholic Church.

Efforts to convert Jews to Roman Catholicism are made by the Catholic Guild of Israel, with English headquarters at Bayswater, London : but it is intimately connected with a kindred French body. I served on its executive, and was favourably impressed by the zeal of its workers—but I think not many converts are made. As Bishop Bidwell said at one of its annual meetings : ' If we are elated only when we find conversions, we are apt to be discouraged when we cannot, and if conversions are withheld we may not have the courage to go on and [we may] think perhaps we had better give up : which would be a false conclusion. Really all we can do in the way of conversion is to remove obstacles, and one of the obstacles is the somewhat unfriendly feeling that exists between Jews and Christians, based no doubt on centuries of prejudice and misunderstanding.'[1] The main method by which this Guild works is by open-air meetings in Jewish districts. (Note.—In April, 1928, Pope Pius XI suppressed a body called ' The Friends of Israel '[2]; that body had no connexion with the Catholic Guild of Israel.)

The Catholic Evidence Guild was founded in 1918 to

[1] *Guild of Israel Annual Report for* 1926, p. 20.
[2] See *The Universe* newspaper, April 20, 1928.

give lectures, expository of Roman doctrine, in parks and other open spaces. Its speakers are mostly young lay-people: though priests also sometimes speak on its platforms. The lay speakers have to possess a licence from the Bishop of their diocese. These licences may be 'general' —i.e. their holders may deal with any relevant subject— or may be confined to one subject only.

The Catholic Confederation of England and Wales was, till the latter part of 1929—I do not say *exclusively*: for no doubt it did some independent work, but at any rate *chiefly*—the inclusive name for the Salford (Lancashire) and Westminster diocesan Catholic Federations. In October, 1929, however, the Salford Federation was disbanded, because 'When a number of prominent members left the movement the Federation received a blow from which it never really recovered so far as membership was concerned.'[1] The Salford Federation was the main organ, in general defence of the Faith, for Lancashire Roman Catholics. Previous to the formation of the first British Labour Government, the Salford Federation persistently attacked the Labour Party on the ground that it is Socialistic, and that Socialism is condemned by Papal encyclicals. In the latter proposition the Federation was correct; but the awkward thing is that not merely Socialism, but the basic principles of the British Constitution and of our modern liberties, are also condemned by Papal encyclicals. As the present writer pointed out (writing as an adherent of no political party) in an article on 'Catholics and Socialism': 'The line of argument, taken up by the [Salford] school, is one which, if properly followed out, would prove that Catholics cannot be loyal citizens of any free modern community at all.'[2] For that article I was bitterly attacked; but it was never refuted.

As to the Westminster Federation, it is organized on a basis of branches democratically electing their officers:

[1] *See The Universe*, November 1, 1929.
[2] In *The Socialist Review*, London, May, 1925.

though the Archbishop for the time being of Westminster can nominate to some offices on the central executive. When I was an active worker on it (1919–1925), I found most of the important work was done by small committees at headquarters. Of those committees one of the chief was that of 'Vigilance': and no doubt it is so still. It keeps a general outlook in defence of the Faith, and pays special attention to the Press. The Westminster Federation was formed in 1905 to defend Roman Catholic schools against legislative 'attacks,' and it continues to be greatly occupied with that subject. However, it has many other activities also; and I myself was estranged from it by its seemingly incurable habit of subterranean intrigue. For example, it endeavoured to institute what can be rightly described only as a 'secret Roman Catholic censorship' over the history-books used in the London County Council and other public elementary (*not* Roman Catholic) schools[1]—eliminating what is displeasing to Roman Catholics and substituting, not merely corrections of actual errors, but also what any impartial person could only describe as Roman Catholic propaganda. Again, in its Annual Report for 1928, it claimed to have 'undertaken the revision' of the new *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. That was an incorrect statement, and had to be corrected by notices widely published in the Press; but it shows the mental outlook of its authors. Editors are, or were—I see no reason why I should suppose it is not so now—constantly approached with threats or persuasions to suppress matter displeasing to Roman Catholics. I do not deny that this Federation does much good work; but its activities are spoiled by this tendency to subterranean manœuvres. Cardinal Bourne, speaking at its Annual Meeting for 1929, said that the Federation 'knew how to act when necessary, and . . . how not to do things when there was nothing to do.'[2] He also expressed

[1] See *The Churchman's Magazine*, London, September, 1929, and *The Methodist Times*, Nov. 21, 1929, for full particulars.

[2] See *The Catholic Times*, October 25, 1929.

'his appreciation of, and gratitude to, the Federation.' That he has no cause for so speaking I am far from saying; but I suggest that His Eminence should consider also the other side of the question: whether subterranean intrigue, which may even alienate erstwhile zealous Roman Catholics from their Church, does not produce what is theologically called 'scandal,' and is therefore hardly deserving his 'gratitude,' but rather his reproof.

A body of recent formation is the Catholic Council for International Relations. It was founded in 1923, and is affiliated to similar bodies in several other countries. Its founder was Mr. John Eppstein, an enthusiastic supporter of the League of Nations, and, in his introduction to a booklet descriptive of its objects, he said: 'The Council then has two objects, logically distinct but actually complementary. The first is to promote unity of action between Catholics of all nations in matters relating to their religion; secondly, to promote international peace.'[1] The difficulty of this is, however, that ecclesiastical action in politics by no means always or necessarily promotes peace. So long as the Roman Church claims—as it still does—to be a 'perfect society,' with rights of political interference and coercion, so long is its action as logically liable to lead to strife as to peace.

The Catholic Social Guild was formed to study economic problems in the light of the encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII. It tends to favour the betterment of working-class conditions on the lines of that Pontiff's encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*, on 'the state of the labourers.' Leo declared that working people should have wages 'sufficient to support them as frugal and well-behaved'; that, 'if, through necessity or fear of a worse evil, the workman accept harder conditions because an employer or contractor will afford him no better, he is made the victim of force and injustice'[2]; and he denounced the 'small number of very rich men

[1] *Catholics and the Problem of Peace* (1925), p. 8.
[2] See *The Pope and the People* (Catholic Truth Society), p. 158.

[who] have been able to lay upon the teeming masses of the labouring poor a yoke little better than that of slavery itself.'[1] However, he advocated Catholic Trade Unions as against 'non-Catholic'[2] ones—thus dividing the workers' forces; and his encyclical was essentially so burdened with reservations as to be ineffective in its supposedly popular tendencies. Moreover, we have seen how, in other encyclicals, he condemned most of our modern liberties.

In co-operation with itself, the Catholic Social Guild helped to establish, in association with Oxford University, a Catholic Workers' College to train selected students in economics from a Roman Catholic point of view. 'The Guild has provided the initiative and publicity which set the College on its feet. . . . The Guild's Executive Committee is the governing body of the College. . . . The two —Guild and College—are intimately bound together in aims and organization.'[3] The influence behind the movement is chiefly that of the Jesuits.

The Society for the Maintenance of the Apostolic See was formed in 1925, to collect funds for the Vatican. It is hard to see why this should be needed, seeing that Roman Catholics already pay Peter's Pence; yet, at the 1928 annual meeting of the Society, Viscount Fitz Alan even advocated 'the extension of the Society not only to every diocese in England, but throughout the world.'[4]

Two relatively small organizations are the Catholic Union and the Catholic Association. The former is in some respects similar to the Catholic Federation; it undertakes to watch over and defend Roman Catholic interests generally. It is, however, an exclusive and aristocratic body, of little representative value. The Catholic Association is confined chiefly to social functions and the arranging

[1] See *The Pope and the People*, p. 134.
[2] Ibid., p. 162.
[3] Rev. C. O'Hea, S.J., in *The Universe*, March 16, 1928.
[4] See *The Tablet* newspaper, March 3, 1928.

of pilgrimages. Then there is the Catenian Association (*catena* : ' a chain ')—perhaps not inaptly to be described as a sort of ' Roman Catholic Freemasons.' It is composed of professional and business men for mutual aid. One of its rules is that clergy cannot attend its private meetings or be members. The Knights of St. Columba (Columba, the Scottish saint) is a body somewhat like the Catenians, but of more recent formation and wider scope. It admits members from all classes and does not exclude the clergy. (Its name is an adaptation of that of the powerful United States Roman Catholic organization, the Knights of Columbus.) It has a monthly magazine, *Columba*. Its influence recently caused the disbandment of a once powerful organization in the Roman Catholic diocese of Southwark : the South London Catholic League, for ' the organization has simply lapsed, because it was found that the Knights of St. Columba supplied the needs of the League.'[1]

An interesting form of activity is the Catholic Citizens' Parliament, which meets at Vauxhall, London, to discuss public questions from a Roman Catholic point of view.

Besides the foregoing organizations, there are the specifically *devotional* Guilds attached to the parishes. The chief is the Guild of the Blessed Sacrament. Then there is the Children of Mary, for unmarried women. The Jesuit churches have the Men's Sodality, *Prima Primaria*, linked up with headquarters at Rome. Of lesser organizations of a devotional kind are the ' Bona Mors ' society (for praying that one may escape an unhappy death) ; the Knights of the Blessed Sacrament (a kind of sentimental ' bond of chivalry,' started before the Great War by the Rev. Edmund Lester, S.J., who had achieved notability by his comical ' answers to correspondents ' in the little Jesuit monthly, *Stella Maris*) ; the St. Vincent de Paul Society (organizing charity amongst distressed Roman Catholics) ; the Catholic Prisoners' Aid Society (for helping people on discharge from prisons). Then there is the Crusade of

[1] See *The Universe*, November 1, 1929.

Rescue, for the reception of destitute children; it was established, after a dispute with Dr. Barnado's Homes, so as to avoid Roman Catholic destitute children being brought up as Protestants.

The various 'religious Orders' and communities of men and women nearly all have branches in England: the Augustinians, the Servites, the Benedictines, the Salesians, the Canons Regular of the Lateran, the Redemptorists, the Carmelites, the Praemonstratensians, the Carthusians, the Passionists, the Reformed Cistercians, the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, the Dominicans, the Jesuits, the various types of Franciscans, the Rosminians. The Benedictine monks have several handsome Abbeys, as Downside and Buckfast. The Dominican friars, and the Redemptorists, engage largely in propaganda work; the other Orders, in educational, parochial, preaching, propaganda, and other activities; and there are the purely *contemplative* Orders—entirely isolated from 'the world,' and devoted to prayer. As for the Jesuits, their characteristic always has been 'variety.' They have colleges for boys of the middle and upper classes, and they engage largely in literary polemics. Their church at Farm Street, Mayfair, London, is a noted centre of propagandist preaching.

Finally, there is the 'Catholic Press.' This is a very efficient engine of propaganda, and may be divided into four categories: 1.—The weeklies; 2.—The monthlies, and the quarterly *Dublin Review*; 3.—The lesser monthlies; and 4.—The books.

The weeklies are: *The Tablet*, *The Universe*, *The Catholic Times*, and *The Catholic Herald* (with its Scottish edition, *The Glasgow Observer*); these are newspapers, and there are also the 'family budgets,' *The Catholic Fireside* and *Home Topics* (formerly *The Catholic Home Journal*)—which are associated with *The Catholic Times* and *The Catholic Herald* respectively.

The Roman Catholic ecclesiastical authorities are always cautious of acknowledging that any periodical represents

them ' officially.' Therefore *The Tablet* does not claim that status ; but the fact remains that two of its proprietors are the Archbishop of Westminster and the Bishop of Nottingham. *The Tablet* is some eighty years old, and, in its early days, was violently political under the editorship of the publicist, Frederick Lucas. Later, under control, it changed. ' [Father ; afterwards Cardinal] Vaughan found *The Tablet* a convenient official organ for expressing his own policy on all important matters, and under the editorship of Mr. Snead-Cox it was conducted with real distinction and literary talent ; though its strongly anti-Irish and Unionist bias made it extremely unpopular with the great majority of Catholics in the country.'[1] During the last ten years it has been edited by Mr. Ernest J. Oldmeadow, a convert from Wesleyan Methodism : Mr. Oldmeadow has banished the former somewhat dull tone of the paper, and made it more interesting ; but, at the same time, it has taken on a tone of bitterness and frequent insult towards opponents, which is extremely regrettable in the organ of a Christian Church. It is to be hoped this will not be permanent.

The Universe is about seventy years old, but, until a few years ago, it had a precarious existence ; was for a time largely given up to articles in the Erse language ; and had frequent changes of editorship. In 1917, however, it was acquired (its previous editor having become a Protestant) by some wealthy Roman Catholics, and, under Mr. Henry S. Dean as editor, it has become the most widely-circulated of the Roman Catholic weeklies. An able and energetic young journalist, Mr. George Barnard, went to America and brought back many ' up-to-date methods,' the adoption of which has given *The Universe* a somewhat Transatlantic tone. The paper has, amongst its regular contributors, Mr. Hilaire Belloc and Mr. G. K. Chesterton, who, in its sheltered columns, can indulge to the full in that lofty scorn

[1] Denis Gwynn, *A Hundred Years of Catholic Emancipation* (Longmans, 1929), p. 242.

and supercilious pity for people who are not Roman Catholics, which is so congenial to those who are.

The Catholic Times was formerly the most popular Roman Catholic weekly, but now seems to have been eclipsed by *The Universe*. However, it retains considerable influence. Until recently, I should have called it the fairest and most balanced of Roman Catholic newspapers; but I am not sure that it will retain that character now it is largely controlled by the Catholic Missionary Society.

The Catholic Herald (and *Glasgow Observer*) is published on a 'localized' system: editions adapted to several provincial centres as well as London. It is an ably-conducted paper, but very vituperative.

The Catholic Fireside and *Home Topics* are simply budgets of 'domestic reading.' *The Month* is the Jesuit magazine, consisting of learned articles on literature and theology. A similar remark applies to *The Dublin Review*, except that it is a quarterly. *The Ransomer* (formerly *The Second Spring*) is the monthly organ of the Guild of Ransom. *The Messenger of the Sacred Heart* (published by the Jesuits at Wimbledon, London) is the monthly organ of the devotional guild, the Apostleship of Prayer, and a study of its pages gives insight into Roman Catholic modes of praying; for example: 'Thanksgivings:—Worthing: Father's recovery from serious illness after wearing Apostleship Badge of the Sacred Heart. . . . Roehampton: The immediate check of infectious illness on the distribution of the badge of the Sacred Heart and promise of publication' . . . &c.[1] *Stella Maris* ('Star of the Sea': a title of the Blessed Virgin), *Introibo* ('Introibo' is the first word of the Mass), *The Poor Soul's Friend* (for encouraging prayer for 'the souls in Purgatory'), *St. Philomena's Bell* (the magazine of St. Monica's Priory, Hoddesdon, Herts), *The Franciscan Monthly* (organ of the English Franciscan friars), *The Rosary* (an organ of the Dominicans), are monthlies of a pious type. *The Catholic Gazette* is the monthly of the

[1] *The Messenger*, November, 1929, p. 352.

Catholic Missionary Society. *Blackfriars* represents the Dominicans of Oxford. *Chimes* is published by the Benedictines of Buckfast, Devonshire. *The Christian Democrat* is a small monthly issued by the Catholic Social Guild. *Columba* represents the Knights of St. Columba.

Thus it will be seen how well supplied the English Roman Catholics are with periodical literature of their own. This is just as well, for, as 'A Librarian' wrote in one of their weeklies, 'Catholics are not a good reading public'[1] as regards general literature. This is not surprising when the principles of the Index of Prohibited Books are remembered. When I once mentioned Mr. H. G. Wells to a pious Roman Catholic young lady, she replied: 'H. G. Wells; who is he? Is he a Jesuit? If not, why should I read him?'—but, of course, this was a very abnormal case. However, the Roman Catholic periodical press steadily maintains amongst its readers a fine spirit of militant Ultramontanism. As to the *books*, we reserve observations for the next chapter.

Before passing to that, however, we must make a few observations on *Scotland*, and some special remarks about *Ireland*.

The Reformation in Scotland was more complete, and (contrary to general impressions in many places) more bloodless by far—as regards Roman Catholics—than in England. True, the Reformers are accused of wholesale pillage of religious buildings. The truth seems to be that they did undoubtedly eject from the old kirks every ornament, devotional object, altar, or other structure characteristic of the old unreformed rites. In so acting, they went logically on their Calvinistic principles: as—had the case been reversed—the Roman Church would have equally thoroughly changed the appearance of the kirks to suit her own worship. It is also true that the mobs destroyed some buildings. It is very doubtful, however, whether the wholesale allegations against the Reformers

[1] *The Universe*, November 2, 1929.

are justified; and an able work in vindication of them should be studied.[1] In any case, the Roman Church in Scotland has no list of *martyrs* as in England and Ireland. The Latin Worship was simply submerged. When the penal laws were finally repealed in 1829, Scottish Roman Catholicism was confined to a few old families and some Highland villages. That Roman Catholic population, however, has very greatly increased since then: mainly from Ireland, whence labourers, attracted by the more favourable conditions, come over, especially to Glasgow, Dundee, and, to a lesser extent, Edinburgh. 'During the last [seventy] years the Catholic population of Scotland has been largely augmented by an Irish immigration, consequent on the demand for labour arising at great industrial centres like Glasgow and Paisley.'[2] This Irish immigration, in fact, is creating a serious economic and racial difficulty in Scotland, where there is a widespread fear that ultimately it may affect the Scottish national development adversely. It is a curious question for sociologists. As for the internal government of the Latin Church in Scotland, suffice it to record that, in 1878, Pope Leo XIII re-established a Roman Catholic regular hierarchy of Bishops there, and that, in doing so, he did what his predecessor had not done in England—revived several of the old titles of Sees, including Archbishoprics of St. Andrews and of Glasgow.

With regard to *Ireland*, the position is in many respects unique in the world. When the Reformation broke out, the immense majority of the Irish people adhered to the unreformed faith, while, by a drastic code of penal laws, the English Government tried to stamp it out. A conflict of religion *and* race went on thereafter. In 1801 Ireland was politically united to Great Britain, but the promised repeal of the penal laws was not enacted until such repeal was forced on the British authorities in 1829. Peace,

[1] *Bell the Cat; or, Who Destroyed the Scottish Abbeys?* by John Jamieson (Stirling, Eneas Mackay, 1902).

[2] Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 766.

however, did not follow; nor was it produced by the disestablishment of the Irish Protestant Church in 1870. The struggle had all along been as much racial as religious, and did not cease till the establishment of the Irish Free State in 1921. Ireland has now two Governments: a Protestant one in six Ulster counties, and a Roman Catholic one in the rest of the island. The ideal which is being aimed at in the Irish Free State is to establish and develop a 'Catholic, Gaelic culture.' The Erse language is compulsory in all schools and in the civil service. Official documents are printed wholly or partly in Erse; everywhere the Erse propaganda is seen: even the street-names are written up in Erse as well as in English. Names of cities are officially changed to Erse forms: Dublin = Baile Atha Cleath (pronounced Blaw-*klĕ*-ă), Queenstown = Cobh (pronounced Cove), &c. In regard to religion, the Roman Catholic Church is officially as well as popularly honoured everywhere. An Ambassador was sent to the Vatican in 1929, and a Papal Nuncio is in residence, by reciprocity, in Dublin. A Censorship of Literature Bill has been enacted by the Free State Parliament (the Dail; pronounced Thawl: th as in *then*).

The present writer was a supporter of Irish claims to self-government, and wrote in their favour[1]; and, as he has not altered his view in that matter, he cannot be ignored or condemned by Irish people as an enemy. With all the more regret, then, does he view certain sad developments in the Free State. The spirit of religious bigotry seems getting into the ascendant. The Censorship Bill, for example, was enthusiastically welcomed by the Roman Catholic Press, both in the Free State itself and in England, in a way clearly showing that it was regarded as having potentialities for action against opponents of Roman Catholicism. True, its provisions ultimately were rendered less dangerous; but still it is a perilous instrument in a

[1] For example, in articles in *The Catholic Times*, March 6, 1920; March 20, 1920; May 29, 1920; May 28, 1921; &c.

land dominated by a religion which is adverse to free institutions. Again, there is continual Press agitation against Protestant propaganda, which is denounced as evil in itself, and referred to in opprobrious terms, such as 'Souperism.' It seems unrealized that Protestants should be as free to conduct propaganda in Ireland as Roman Catholics are in England. Yet again, there is a fierce campaign against Freemasonry, the most violent language being employed against it. One feature of this campaign will astonish English readers. In one widely circulated Dublin Roman Catholic monthly,[1] several pages were devoted to lists of full names and addresses, headed 'List of Dublin Freemasons.' This in the same paper as had violent denunciatory articles against Freemasonry. What can be the object in view? Is it to bring personal ruin or persecution on those thus 'pilloried'? The present writer is not a Freemason; but this is no question of this, that, or the other particular craft or society: all that is at issue is fair play.

As a lover and admirer of Ireland, the writer trusts the spirit of persecution will not be allowed to develop there.

[1] *The Catholic Pictorial* (now *The Catholic Mind*), September, October, &c., 1929. Cf. *Sunday Times*, London, Jan. 19, 1930.

ROMAN CATHOLIC LITERATURE

Gc

Chapter V

ROMAN CATHOLIC LITERATURE

It is not surprising that Roman Catholic authors were few and far between in English literature until very modern times: that is, of course, since the Reformation. Dryden and Pope are the greatest of the names they can claim. This scarcity of Roman Catholic literary luminaries is, after all, only natural considering that, until 1829, the adherents of that creed in this realm were legally proscribed or under grave disabilities. In this chapter we will take a brief survey of Roman Catholic literature in England since, and including, Lingard.

John Lingard holds a unique place in English literature for two reasons: he was a priest who, living at the very end of the penal laws period, practically laid the foundations of modern English Roman Catholic literature; and he was a historian of singularly judicial temper. He was born in the village of Claxby, Lincolnshire, in 1771. At the age of eleven he was sent to the College of Douai, on the Continent. Here he was a witness of the terrible revolutionary outbreaks of those days. 'Twice had the garrison of the town broken loose; the excesses of the soldiery had again and again intruded within the walls of the College: and while blood was flowing in the market-place, and peaceful citizens were being hurried to the gibbet, the bayonet had been pointed at the breasts of the students, and the sword had more than once been bared over the heads of the superiors of the house. It was only in the June of 1790, that our youthful student [Lingard] had himself narrowly escaped destruction.'[1] He managed to escape to England,

[1] Rev. M. A. Tierney, *Memoir of Lingard* (prefixed to the 1854 ed. of the latter's *History of England*, vol. i., p. 4).

and took up his residence with Lord Stourton, as tutor to that nobleman's son. He was ordained a priest in 1795. The rest of his life was essentially literary, and he died in 1851. His most notable works are *The History of the Anglo-Saxon Church* and the ten-volumed *History of England to* 1688 ; but he engaged considerably in controversy also.

The most notable feature of Lingard's *History of England*, as regards the Roman Catholic Church, is its freedom from excessive Papalism. In fact, the small body of English Roman Catholics in those days tended to minimize as much as possible the authority of the Pope, and to lay stress on their own English loyalty. As a modern Roman Catholic writer says: 'A strong reaction against the central authority of Rome, which was fashionable throughout central Europe at the time, had begun to affect all their views.'[1] There is something really comic about the fact that the extreme Ultramontane modern writer, Mr. Hilaire Belloc, has written a 'supplementary volume' to Lingard's *History*, and that it has on its title-page 'by John Lingard and Hilaire Belloc.' Belloc's ideas differ from those held by Lingard as the tropics differ from the temperate zone. Lingard alludes to Pope Innocent III and the Papal 'pretended authority in temporal matters'[2]; of Joan of Arc (now a canonized Saint of the Roman Catholic Church) he wrote: 'An impartial observer would have pitied and respected the mental delusion with which she was afflicted'[3]; of Pope Pius V's Bull deposing Queen Elizabeth he wrote: 'If the Pontiff promised himself any particular benefit from this measure, the result must have disappointed his expectations. The time was gone by when the thunders of the Vatican could shake the thrones of princes.'[4] In short, Lingard's *History*, valuable though it is as such, is chiefly interesting as showing how modern English Roman Catholicism differs from what it was a century ago.

[1] Denis Gwynn, *The Struggle for Catholic Emancipation*, p. 46.
[2] *History of England*, ed. 1854, ii., 153 note.
[3] Ibid., iv., 21. [4] Ibid., vi., 111.

The Oxford Movement in the Church of England, and the setting up of a hierarchy of Roman Catholic Bishops in England by Pius IX in 1850, made all the difference. The Oxford Movement revived the controversy about Papal power, and it brought into the Roman Catholic Church a number of able Englishmen who, as converts, became enthusiastic for the full claims of their new Faith. The setting up of the Bishoprics brought Papal claims prominently to the fore.

Cardinal Wiseman, indeed—the first Archbishop of Westminster,—was himself not only a true Ultramontane, but also an able writer and lecturer and a keen propagandist. ' From the foundation of *The Dublin Review* in 1836 he had been closely associated with it, and in its early years it published a series of important articles by him which revealed the close and sympathetic observation with which he continued to follow the Oxford Movement [he regarded it as a means of gaining converts to Rome]. And in July, 1839 [of course, he was then not yet a Cardinal or Archbishop], he published in it his article on St. Augustine and the Donatists which was one of the landmarks in the history of Newman's conversion.'[1] Wiseman, besides his writings, delivered public lectures advocating Roman Catholic doctrine.

The secession of John Henry Newman, and many of his followers, from the English to the Roman Church, brought a great accession of talent to Roman Catholicism in England ; but even here there were difficulties and complications. The converts ' had to face not only the agony of separation from their work [their old clerical duties in the Church of England], their former ties, and their friends, but a very genuine feeling of distrust among the Catholics with whom they had to form new associations.'[2] As a matter of fact, for many years *Newman's* life was a weary record of discouragement. His work, *An Essay on the Development*

[1] Denis Gwynn, *A Hundred Years of Catholic Emancipation*, p. 25.
[2] Ibid., p. 65.

of Christian Doctrine, had been written while he was still in the Church of England, and is really a sketch of the mental process which brought him over to Rome. It recognizes that the modern Papal claims are not found, as they now exist, in the early Church ; and it endeavours to explain that fact by a theory of ' development according to type,' the Roman developments being the true outfoldings of the principles of Christianity, and ' heretical ' ones being perversions. This theory, beautifully though Newman expounded it, is really of little theological value to the Roman cause. *Any one*, by selecting such principles as he chooses to call ' the real ones,' can arrange historic facts to show that this or that form of Christianity is the only genuine development ; or, on the other hand, that no single development is the only true one, but all have their place. Newman's book is only a beautiful piece of special pleading in favour of one theory ; moreover, it is spoiled by the fundamental fallacy of the whole Roman development—namely, that, by saying ' Revelation cannot be added to,' and yet at times publishing new articles of faith, Rome contradicts herself.[1] However, it was by this process of thought that Newman persuaded himself into the Roman communion, and it has been constantly used as a controversial weapon, by Roman Catholic apologists, to explain away the facts of history. His *Grammar of Assent*, written over twenty years after his reception into the Roman communion, was an elaborate attempt to explain *certitude* in religion, by the theory of an ' illative sense '—' the power of judging and concluding, when in its perfection,'[2] which brings *certainty*. The trouble, however, about this is : (1) So many men judge differently from one another, and yet feel sure they are right ; and who is to say which is correct ? and (2) Newman's whole treatment of the subject leads to doubt rather than to belief, and probably has made more Agnostics than Roman Catholics. Another

[1] See herein, pp. 25–36.
[2] *Grammar of Assent*, part II., chap. ix., § 2.

work of his which was regarded with suspicion was his *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*, published in 1875 in defence of the Vatican Council against the criticisms of Mr. W. E. Gladstone. His way of 'defending' those decrees was to explain them away till they had little meaning at all. For example, he said: 'When, then, Mr. Gladstone asks Catholics how they can obey the Queen and yet obey the Pope, since it may happen that the commands of the two authorities may clash, I answer, that it is my *rule*, both to obey the one and to obey the other, but that there is no rule in this world without exceptions, and if either the Pope or the Queen demanded of me an "Absolute Obedience," he or she would be transgressing the laws of human nature and human society. I give an absolute obedience to neither.'[1] This, of course, is sound enough; but it is the Protestant principle of private judgement. Newman's book was 'delated' (complained of as heretical) to Rome, and narrowly escaped being put on the Index. In short, Newman was a very two-sided acquisition to the Roman Catholic Church. He gave it a higher intellectual standing in England, and his influence made many converts; but how many more people has his intellectual method made into Agnostics?

A very different type of mind from Newman's was that of W. G. Ward ('Ideal' Ward), who also was a convert from the Church of England. It was of him that Tennyson wrote this verse:

> Farewell, whose living like I shall not find,
> Whose Faith and Work were bells of full accord,
> My friend, the most unworldly of mankind,
> Most generous of all Ultramontanes, Ward,
> How subtle at tierce and quart of mind with mind,
> How loyal in the following of thy Lord!

'Ultramontane'!—that was the true term to apply to William George Ward. In his book, *The Ideal of a Christian*

[1] *Letter* (Pickering, London, 1875), p. 53.

Church, written while still in the English Church, he had held up Rome as 'the great exemplar'; and, when he formally 'went over,' he took the extreme view as to her claims. He was all for full 'infallibilism,' and was opposed to the liberal-minded views (comparatively speaking !) taken by Newman in the magazine, *The Rambler*. 'To such as Faber [Father F. W. Faber, the famous hymn-writer, emotional theologian, and convert from the Church of England] and W. G. Ward, the intellectualism which coloured *The Rambler* appeared so opposed to the Catholic spirit that they were not disposed to dwell on its positive merits much more than were the Bishops themselves.'[1] Ward's Ultramontanism undoubtedly represented the spirit of the modern Papacy, as Newman's type of thought did *not*. Ward's descendants continued, and still continue, active in English Roman Catholicism. His son, Wilfrid Ward, wrote (by a curious irony !) the standard *Life of Newman*; and Wilfrid's daughter, Miss Maisie Ward, is one of the founders of the Catholic Evidence Guild. She married Mr. F. J. Sheed, another founder of the C.E.G., and they established the publishing firm of Messrs. Sheed & Ward, which has provided wholesome competition to the almost 'monopoly' which set in when the old firms of Burns & Oates and Washbourne were amalgamated as Burns, Oates & Washbourne.

John Emerich Edward Dalberg (the first Lord Acton) was one of the most remarkable figures connected with Roman Catholicism in England in the nineteenth century, (he was born in 1834 and died in 1902). He was of Bavarian descent, and was a remarkable linguist. 'Much of his exceptional mastery of historical literature may be ascribed to the fact that the principal languages of Europe were as familiar to him as his native tongue [German].'[2] He became a naturalized Englishman, and, before being made a peer, sat in Parliament for an Irish constituency. He was a

[1] Rev. H. Thurston, S.J., in *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, i., p. 114.
[2] Ibid.

Liberal in politics and very liberal in his whole outlook. He succeeded Newman as editor of *The Rambler* (afterwards *The Historical and Foreign Review*). 'The ultra-liberal tone of this journal gave offence to ecclesiastical authorities, and Acton evidently judged it necessary to discontinue its publication.'[1] Acton was a strong opponent of all forms of tyranny, and, as a profound historical student, he exposed scathingly the persecuting history of the Papacy. He went to Rome in 1870 to oppose the proposals to make Papal Infallibility an article of faith. When that was done, however, he did not leave the Roman communion; but all his life he retained a bitter feeling towards the Papal government.[2] He became Professor of Modern History at Cambridge University, and laid the plans of that fine library, *The Cambridge Modern History*. His writings are chiefly found in magazines and reviews, as he wrote no long book.

Another eminent liberal-minded Roman Catholic was Mr. St. George Mivart, the biologist. He was excommunicated for the progressive theological views he expressed; and, when he died, Cardinal Vaughan forbade any priest to officiate at his funeral.

A very different type of writer was Thomas William Allies (1813–1903). 'He was one in whom the poetical vein was tenderly blended with the philosopher's wisdom.'[3] He was a son of a rector of Wormington, and himself became a Church of England clergyman in 1838. He wrote a book in defence of the English Church against Rome: *The Church of England cleared from the Charge of Schism* (1846). Four years later, however, he was himself a convert to the Roman Catholic Church. Being married, he could not become a priest, so he devoted himself to educational work and literature. He was an enthusiastic advocate of Papal claims, and his masterpiece is the eight-volumed

[1] Rev. H. Thurston, S.J., in *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, i., p. 114.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Mary H. Allies, in *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, i., p. 323.

work, *The Formation of Christendom*, on which he was occupied from 1861 till 1895. He wrote also *The See of St. Peter* (1850), *St. Peter, his Name and Office* (1852), and an account of his conversion to Rome : *A Life's Decision* (1880).

We must now turn to English Roman Catholic writers living in our own times. Of these the most effective is certainly Mr. Hilaire Belloc, and his special field is history. He is aggressively Ultramontane, and adopts frequently a tone of contempt towards writers who differ from him. His attitude is this : 'Such and such alone is the [Roman] Catholic Church ; if it be not what it claims to be, then all is void.'[1] And : 'There is no true history, in the absolute sense of the word "true," which is written upon the basis of, or to prove, a false philosophy.'[2] That is to say : True history must be based on true philosophy ; the Roman Catholic philosophy is the only true one ; *ergo*, true history must be based on the Roman Catholic philosophy.

This reasoning has two fatal fallacies. First of all, it assumes that history should be written to fit in with a theory formed beforehand : whereas, in reality, history-writing should be an impartial record of facts, and theories should be drawn from the facts themselves. Second, it assumes that Mr. Belloc can dogmatically declare Roman Catholicism to be a true philosophy in the sense of being a sovereign guide in historical studies. He may believe it true as *a religion*, but he may by no means go further. If he does, he adopts a system fatal to all history-writing. There are many religions. If one believer can say, 'My religion alone is the test for writing history,' so can another, and others also ; then there is a deadlock, making it impossible to come to any agreed historical conclusions. Mr. Belloc, in short, is not a scientific historian, for he has a radically bad method of dealing with the subject. He

[1] *The Catholic Church and History* (1926), end.
[2] In *The Universe*, June 4, 1926 : (also constantly repeated elsewhere).

would fit facts to theories, instead of forming theories from facts. In the same way, the mediaeval schoolmen refused to believe that the heavenly bodies could move in any way except in circles : for, said they, the heavenly bodies are perfect, and circular motion is perfect motion. Alas for theory !—the heavenly bodies *do* move in other ways than in circles.

Of late years Mr. Belloc has had a habit of contributing series of controversial articles, on the ' syndication ' plan, to Roman Catholic papers in various English-speaking countries : in England, to *The Universe.* In one of these series (*How the Reformation Happened* : 1927, afterwards in book-form), he reviewed the origin of the religious upheaval of the sixteenth century. He admitted the great evils which existed in the Church ; the terrible reign of the Borgia Pope, Alexander VI, for example, he said nearly ruined the Church. By admitting so fully these evils, Mr. Belloc seems to be trying to ' spike the guns ' of critics of the Roman Catholic Church. ' You see,' his thought seems to run, ' that I, a Catholic, frankly state these evils, yet I still believe in the Church. Why ? Because they were merely human faults of the Church's members, and did not destroy or vitiate her Divine inner life.' If that is the implication (and what else can it be ?), it seems refuted by the facts. The claims of the Roman Catholic Church are not confined to its *defined doctrine* only, but also to its *government* : or, rather, its defined doctrine makes high claims also for its *government.* At the Vatican Council of 1870 it was declared to be an article of faith, from which ' no one can deviate without loss of his faith and salvation,' that the Roman Pontiff has ' a truly episcopal power,' which is an ' immediate power ' over all the faithful, and that all Catholics are bound by it ' by the obligation of true obedience, not only in things which pertain to faith and morals, but also in things pertaining to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world.' So it is ' of faith,' in the Roman Catholic Church, that the Papal

power of government is ' by divine right ' over all. How, however, on Mr. Belloc's own showing, was that power working when the Reformation broke out? Mr. Belloc says: ' The official organization of the Catholic Church had been thrown suddenly into disarray. . . . There had been gross and universal corruption, there had further been for so long a growing scepticism and indifference that the power of the clerical organization to reform itself was numbed and atrophied. Attack from without was therefore easy, rapid, and explosive; reform from within was apparently impossible; the complicated machinery was ill-kept and incapable of rapid re-adjustment. Under so violent a strain the gear jammed. And the papacy, which controlled all, was in the worst case of all.'[1] Yet, in another book, Mr. Belloc writes of the Roman Catholic Church thus: 'As for the Faith itself it stands immovable in the midst of all hostile things; they arise and pass before that majestic presence:—*Stat et stabit, manet et manebit: spectator orbis* [She stands and will stand; she remains and will remain: the watcher of the world].'[2] It will not do! ' The Faith ' includes a belief in the Papal government as of divine right; yet facts show it is but human, very fallible, and has largely produced the very evils it condemns. In short, its claims are disproved by facts.[3]

Mr. *Gilbert Keith Chesterton* has been, since joining the Roman communion a few years ago, one of its zealous champions. He, like Mr. Belloc (who, indeed, seems always greatly to have influenced ' G.K.C.'), contributes regularly to *The Universe*; and, whereas Mr. Belloc is bitter to opponents, ' G.K.C.' adopts an attitude of good-natured pity.

Mr. Chesterton, though he definitely entered the Roman Catholic Church only recently (in 1923), clearly always had

[1] *How the Reformation Happened*, p. 218.
[2] *Survivals and New Arrivals*, p. 12.
[3] For a fuller analysis of Mr. Belloc's apologetics, see *Hilaire Belloc Keeps the Bridge*, by the present writer (Watts & Co., London, 1928).

a tendency bound to end there. Right back a quarter of a century ago, in his weekly articles then in the *Daily News*, the 'Catholic' spirit was obvious. It was obvious in articles he contributed at that time to the *Clarion* newspaper in reply to Mr. Robert Blatchford's attacks on Christianity: articles afterwards reprinted in bookform, with those of other writers. Mr. Chesterton, defending the Church against the charge that it is discredited by such atrocities as the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, there said: 'Every great and useful institution has committed such crimes. . . . The institution called Government, or the State, has a past more shameful than a pirate ship. Every legal code on earth has been full of ferocity and heartrending error.'[1]

If 'G.K.C.' was arguing like this in 1904, it is not surprising that eventually he became formally a member of the Roman Catholic Church. The argument he thus presented, however, is a fallacy. 'Government, or the State,' is a *natural* institution constructed by men. The Roman Catholic Church claims to be a *supernatural* institution uniquely constructed by God. Mr. Chesterton's argument would destroy the latter claim, and reduce the Roman Catholic Church to a level with any other fallible human institution.

Shortly after his reception into the Roman communion, Mr. Chesterton, addressing the Roman Catholic Congress at Birmingham, said: 'The modern non-Catholic world has reached a point when it is beginning to understand that the [Roman] Catholic Church does not die. Right from the beginning of the Christian era a number of mad dogs have made savage attacks upon the Catholic Church. In every case there was an apparent probability that the Catholic Church would perish of the bite. But the Catholic Church lived. It is the Protestant dogs who are dead.'[2] Mr.

[1] *The Religious Doubts of Democracy* (London, Macmillan, 1904), pp. 106–7.

[2] See the *Tablet* newspaper, August 11, 1923.

Chesterton, in view of the offence that was taken at these words, afterwards explained that he had had no intention of ' expressing personal contempt for all Protestants. . . . The mad dogs mentioned were merely all the wild theories that have troubled Christendom from Manicheanism to Mormonism.'[1]

Do ' theories,' however, go about apart from human beings? Theories are the expressions of human thought, and have no existence apart from the men and women who hold and express them. Neither could ' G.K.C.'s' remark have applied merely to some ' wild theories . . . from Manicheanism to Mormonism,' only. He referred to an age-long struggle between the Roman Catholic Church and its opponents. The following dilemma then exists: Either he must admit that Roman claims have triumphed only over the wilder oppositions; or else that they have triumphed over *all* oppositions. If he meant the first, he admitted the victory of the more legitimate opponents. If he meant the second, he was saying what is not correct. Which has triumphed in the modern world—the ideals of the mediaeval Papacy, or the Reformation principle of private judgement? The mediaeval ideals are dead: except in Papal encyclicals; the Reformation principle controls modern civilization.

In a little book[2] on the process by which people are converted to the Roman Catholic Church, Mr. Chesterton argued that the unique characteristics of that Church are that it is not only right when we are right (which any fashionable or merely human institution might be), but also is right when we are wrong (which shows it is superior to human errors); and he also contended that it is the one religion which is always both new and old (thus showing it possesses a unique Divine life).

This, however, is a mere fancy picture, not true to life.

[1] In the *Sunday Express*, August 19, 1923.

[2] *The Catholic Church and Conversion* (London, Burns & Oates, 1927).

Was the Roman Church superior to all mere human fashions and errors, when it used, in the Middle Ages, all the cruel engines of the time? Was it always right when it condemned the Copernican theory? Has it been always right when it has developed new articles of faith although it says that there can be no additions to Revelation? The development of the Roman Church followed the lines of ordinary human growth; a mingling of truth and error. The fault of 'G.K.C.' is that he sees facts in a mist of romance; no doubt that adds beauty to them, but we need to see facts *as they are.*

In a volume of essays, issued at the end of 1929, Mr. Chesterton begins by complaining that 'I find that my co-religionists are being pelted with insults for saying that their religion is right,'[1] and he adds that 'every one is allowed to be controversial except ourselves.' Is not such a statement very perverse? If anything, Roman Catholic propaganda is rather favoured in many quarters, and, in any case, surely a Church which places the brand of heresy and anathema on all views opposed to its own can hardly pretend to a superiority of gentleness of speech. As to the general contents of this book by 'G.K.C.,' it consists of miscellaneous essays on 'The Sceptic as Critic,' 'Logic and Lawn Tennis,' 'Why I am a Catholic,' 'What Do They Think,' &c. As to why Mr. Chesterton is 'a Catholic,' the principal reason he advances is that (as he alleges) Roman Catholicism occupies a central position in a world which is continually changing: 'A study of the true historical cases commonly shows us the spirit of the age going wrong, and the Catholics at least relatively going right. It is a mind surviving a hundred moods.' Such a statement is a caricature of the facts. Roman Catholicism has *not* remained always the same. The Papacy now differs vastly from the Roman See in the time of the Council of Nicaea. The Roman Catholic Church has changed its mind over and over again. In 1415, at the Council of

[1] *The Thing* (Sheed & Ward). (Quotations from pp. 9, 10, 77, 78.)

Constance, it thought very differently, of the position of the Papacy, from what it came to think in 1870 at the Vatican Council. The trouble with 'G.K.C.' is that he has in his mind a fanciful picture of the Roman Church. No wonder he says 'the Catholic Church remains in the best sense a mystery even to believers.' It can be interpreted so very variously!

We may here allude to the arguments of an able and picturesque writer who exercised a good deal of influence at the end of the nineteenth, and the beginning of the present, centuries, and whose tendency was emphatically Roman Catholic although he was not formally a member of that Church.[1] In some ways, the position of Mr. W. H. Mallock (he died in 1925), in regard to religion, was strange. In his book, *Religion as a Credible Doctrine*, he argued that theologians have not refuted the Rationalist arguments against religion, but that neither have the Rationalists found a basis of reasonable thought or morals apart from religion; that, however, all reasoning seems to end in contradictions; and therefore that we may believe religion as being true though not provable as such.

The Roman Catholic Church would reject such arguments. It says religion can be proved by reason. However, Mallock undoubtedly disposed many people to receive favourably the claims of the Roman Church. His most notable pro-Roman book was *Doctrine and Doctrinal Disruption* (A. & C. Black, 1900), in which he contrasted Protestant confusion with Roman unity. His description of the Roman Catholic Church was that of 'an articulate and infallible Church, a Church always the same and yet always developing.' 'Is,' he asked, 'doubt thrown on the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ? The Church of Rome replies, "I was at the door of the Sepulchre myself.

[1] *The Universe*, at the time of his death, said without qualification that he had been 'received.' From letters in the *New Statesman* during the weeks of August, 1926, however, it would seem that Mallock was unconscious at the time.

My eyes saw the Lord come forth. My eyes saw the cloud receive Him." Is doubt thrown on Christ's miraculous birth? The Church of Rome replies, "I can attest the fact, even if no other witness can; for the angel said 'Hail!' in my ear as well as Mary's."'

What is this, more than rhetoric? The Roman Catholic Church consists of individual members who die like other people do. None of them, now living, was present at the Annunciation or the Resurrection. What Mallock meant, then, was merely that the credentials of the Roman Catholic Church, for the truth of its tradition, are satisfactory. As to that, we have seen how much the reverse is the case! However, Mallock's book was also notable for a very elaborate 'biological' argument. He likened the Roman Catholic Church to an 'organism.' Protestantism, he said, is defective: 'the utmost we get [in Protestant denominations] is an organism of an abortive kind, deficient in power of selecting and assimilating nutriment, wanting in limbs and organs essential to healthy life, and endowed above all with a very imperfect consciousness.'[2] The Roman Church, on the other hand, 'is, of all the Christian organizations, the one which exhibits the most permanent and most highly differentiated structure'[3]; and 'being thus endowed, as we have seen, with a single brain [the Papacy, working through the succession of Bishops from the beginning], the Church is endowed also with a single historic memory.'[4] *Ergo!*—Rome speaks *from knowledge*, as other bodies do not.

This argument rests on the biological distinction which says that organisms with many co-operating members are higher in the scale than those with less; but, again, what is this argument of Mallock's, but a piece of rhetoric? The Roman Catholic Church has *not* only one single brain; it has as many brains as it has human beings belonging to it—and these die and are born in successive generations.

[1] *Doctrine and Doctrinal Disruption*, p. 161.
[2] Ibid., p. 197. [3] Ibid., p. 196. [4] Ibid., p. 192.

We get back to this, then : Has the Roman Church such evidences, in favour of its claims, as to prove them clearly true ? We have seen what a lot there is to be said in the negative ! As to the elaborate organization of Rome, it is no proof of *truth* ! Indeed, it tends to show Rome to be a mere one-sided development, for it omits to allow for the free, progressive growth of the human mind, and that mind constantly has had to choose between stagnation or repudiation of the Papal claims. The Roman Church has not the characteristics of the all-sufficient, all-true channel of truth ; but of a one-sided and therefore defective development.

The Rev. (afterwards Monsignor : a mere honorary title, carrying, in itself, no official duties) Robert Hugh Benson, was a son of Archbishop Benson of Canterbury, and was an enthusiastic convert to Rome. He wrote several works on theology, but they contain nothing novel, being simply popular restatements of the Roman claims. His fame rested chiefly on his series of picturesque religious romances : the historical ones—*The King's Achievement* (Henry VIII), *The Queen's Tragedy* (Mary Tudor), *Come Rack, Come Rope* (Elizabeth), *Oddsfish !* (Charles II) ; *The Necromancers* (on Spiritualism), *The Conventionalists* (on general religious problems), and *Lord of the World* and *The Dawn of All* (stories of ' the future '). Of these, *Come Rack, Come Rope* and *The Queen's Tragedy* are the best. The former of them concerned a young man, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, whose father had outwardly conformed to the new form of the Church, but had not done so at heart. His son (Robin Audrey) became a priest, and, after training on the Continent, returned secretly to England. His father had become a zealous enemy of priests, and was ultimately the cause of his own son being captured, hanged, drawn, and quartered. The last passage in the book is intensely dramatic : ' Against the ladder on which he stood, a man's figure was writhing and embracing the rungs, kneeling on the ground. He was strangely dressed, in some sort of a

loose gown, in a tight silk night-cap, and his feet were bare. The man's head was dropped, and the priest could not see his face. He looked beyond for some explanation, and there stood, all alone, a girl in a hooded cloak, who raised her great eyes to his. As he looked down again the man's head had fallen back, and the face was staring up at him, so distorted with speechless entreaty, that even he, at first, did not recognize it. Then he saw it to be his father, and understood enough, at least, to act as a priest for the last time. He smiled a little, leaned his own head forward as from a cross, and spoke: "*Absolvo te a peccatis tuis in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti*" [The formula of absolution in confession: 'I absolve thee from thy sins, in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit']. He only awoke once again, after the strangling and the darkness had passed. He could see nothing, nor hear, except a heavy murmuring noise, not unpleasant. But there was one last Pain now into which all others had passed, keen and cold like water, and it was about his heart. "O Christ ['As Thy arms, O Christ, were extended on the Cross; even so receive me into the arms of Thy mercy, and blot out all my sins with Thy most precious Blood']," he whispered, and so died.' [1]

This book, and others of Mgr. Benson's historical romances, were, as will be gathered from this extract, idealizations of the Roman Catholic side of the struggles of the Reformation. The real purpose of *Come Rack, Come Rope*, seems to have been to counteract Kingsley's *Westward Ho!* However, in *The Queen's Tragedy*, Benson was singularly impartial and very sympathetic to the Protestant martyrs burnt by Queen Mary. *Lord of the World* and *The Dawn of All* were 'anticipations of the future': the first depicting the Roman Catholic Church as reduced to a handful, and Antichrist as coming; followed by the coming of the Last Day!—the other representing the Roman Church as triumphant, and the Pope as ruler of

[1] *Come Rack. Come Rope* (Hutchinson, London, 1912), p. 412.

the world! Both books were excessively far-fetched, and markedly inferior to Benson's other stories. However, he exercised great influence over English Roman Catholic readers. He died, aged little more than forty, worn out by the excessive energy of his burning zeal, which had made him attempt to do ten men's work.

Of other Roman Catholic writers we need here mention only six, of whom the last five are still living. Cardinal (formerly Abbot) *Aidan Gasquet* was the great defender of the old monasteries. His chief works were: *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries*, *The Last Abbot of Glastonbury*, *Monastic Life in the Middle Ages*, and *The Eve of the Reformation*. Gasquet was a deep scholar and student of the original documents; but he was emphatically a partisan, painting the old times in persuasive words as noble above all. His works should be studied side by side with those of Dr. G. G. Coulton, of Cambridge: *Studies in Mediaeval Life and Thought*, *Five Centuries of Religion*, *A Mediaeval Garner*, *The Mediaeval Village*. Cardinal Gasquet died in 1927.

Father *O. R. Vassall-Phillips* is a popular and eloquent preacher, as well as a voluminous writer. His most notable works are *The Mustard Tree: An Argument on Behalf of the Divinity of Christ*, and *Catholic Christianity*. The former is really an argument on behalf of the claims of the Roman Church, by contending that the life and action of the Christian Church (which is assumed to be solely the Roman Catholic Church) witness to Christ, its Founder, as having been, and being, Divine. To this argument the comment applicable is that the proofs of Christ's Divinity are found in its own evidences in the Gospel, and in the world at large on which it has worked; and the history of the Roman Catholic Church, taken alone, would be no proof of the Divinity of Christ. Is the Inquisition a proof of the Divinity of the Founder of a Church which utilized it? Is the Papal Monarchy in Italy a proof that it was founded by Him who said 'My Kingdom is not of this world'?—

and who was Divine? Another work of Father Vassall-Phillips—*Catholic Christianity*—is a general argument for the Roman Church, based on the evidences for it as stated by the Vatican Council of 1870—its growth and spread; its sanctity; its fruitfulness in good works; its unity and persistence. To this argument the reply seems inevitable: Worldly power, political intrigue, persecution of opponents (even burning great numbers at the stakes), and wars, have contributed largely to Roman unity and persistence: which, moreover, have been far from perfect, as is seen in, for example, the Great Schism of the West. As to 'sanctity,' no one denies the Roman Church has produced great Saints, but it has produced also the evils just mentioned; moreover, other Churches also have produced great Saints. As to growth and spread, has not the Roman Church become but a minority of Christians? As to good works, are not other Churches also fruitful in them?—and, moreover, must not the evils, above-mentioned, be reckoned, in the history of the Roman Church, as well as its good works? In short, the 'marks of the Church,' quoted by Father Vassall-Phillips, are no evidence at all for the exclusive Roman claims.

Father *Vincent McNabb*, a friar of the Order of Preachers (Dominicans), is a very able and prolific writer. He has taken rather an independent line in matters of social reform, wherein he is decidedly liberal. However, he is of course a thoroughly orthodox Roman Catholic. His writings are all small books; so we must content ourselves with a glance at one. In his treatise on *Infallibility*,[1] he argues: It is 'antecedently probable' that there should be an infallible Church and Pope, because a dogmatic Revelation requires such; infallibility is not 'inspiration' but a *guidance*, by which the Church is preserved from teaching error; and we learn from the Gospels that Christ did set up such a Church.

[1] An essay read to the St. Thomas of Canterbury Society, London, 1905. (Book form, 2nd ed., 1927.)

Is it not, however, a fatal mistake to base our theories on what is 'antecedently probable': *i.e.*, on what *we think God ought to do*? As to the contention that a Church, such as the Roman, was instituted by Christ as His sole Church, this belief rests on a selection of evidence to suit it, and ignoring what is against it. When, further, we see the working of the theory in history, we are compelled by facts to reject it.

Abbot *John Chapman*, now head of the Benedictine monks in England, is the author of learned works. His most notable controversial one is *Bishop Gore and the Catholic Claims*, a reply to that famous Anglican scholar's *Roman Catholic Claims*. It is impossible here to review so detailed a controversy; so one remark must suffice: On pages 47–8 Abbot Chapman argues that the Papal view of St. Peter was held by the Greek Fathers of the Church —for they applied to that Apostle terms such as *prostates*, *hegoumenos* ('leader'), *proechon* ('prominent one'), &c. The fact is, however, that this argument was refuted in detail in so famous and available a book as Isaac Barrow's *Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy* [1]—*written 225 years before the issue of Abbot Chapman's book*!

The works of *Dr. William Barry* (Canon of Birmingham Roman Catholic Cathedral) long ago gained him high reputation not only amongst Roman Catholic readers, but also amongst literary people in general. His most notable work relevant to our present subject is *The Papal Monarchy* (one of the *Story of the Nations* series); in it he was exceedingly frank about the grim features of the history of Papal Temporal Power, He was equally candid in a smaller book, *The Papacy and Modern Times* (one of the *Home University Library* series).

The Rev. *Vernon Johnson*, a convert to the Roman communion in 1929, was a noted Anglo-Catholic preacher ('Father Vernon'). In his book, *One Lord, One Faith*, he gave an account of his conversion, which he ascribes to

[1] See the Scottish Reformation Society edition, 1852, pp. 93–9.

reading the life of the 'Little Flower' (St. Theresa of Lisieux), and to a realization of the need for Church unity, and of the existence of that unity only in the Roman communion. As to the latter argument, the general considerations against it apply to Mr. Johnson's remarks; while, as to holiness as shown by one Saint or many, what we have said already, when considering Father Vassall-Phillips' arguments, applies also here. 'Father Vernon' seems to have gone by a foregone assumption—however unconscious he may have been of the fact—as to what a Church *ought to be*, rather than to have examined history to see whether or not it *is* so. The intellectual value of his book is negligible, as it shows an astonishing absence of real knowledge of the Bible or Church history; so much is that the case, that one reviewer,[1] who as a rule is far from unfavourable to the Church party to which 'Father Vernon' belonged, said of his 'apologia': '[It has] a certain bitter interest for those concerned with the intellectual training of Anglican priests.' It would be excessively unjust, however, to judge the Church of England by this book of 'Father Vernon's.' The book's chief interest is in showing the emotional basis of much of the excessively 'sacerdotalist' school in the Anglo-Catholic movement. A similar remark applies to the 'apologia' of another convert to Rome from that movement: Father Ronald Knox, who evidently was practically a Roman Catholic long before he realized it[2]; and seems to have acted almost as such in the Anglican Church.

[1] Evelyn Underhill, in *The Spectator*, November 9, 1929.
[2] Knox, *A Spiritual Aeneid* (Longmans, 1918), pp. 43, 88, 102, especially (but, indeed, all through the book).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Chapter VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

We have now taken as comprehensive a survey as is possible in our space of the claims and present position of the Roman Catholic Church. This chapter will be devoted to drawing, from the facts we have set out, the conclusions to which they seem to point.

The main conclusion is this : The Roman Catholic Church is committed, both in its doctrine and in its principles of government (though these two factors are really so mingled that they cannot be separated), to maxims which put it in direct conflict with the principles of progressive civilization. This may seem a harsh conclusion ; but the facts are clear.

As we have seen, the following are the principles on which the Roman Church's theory of Church and State is based : The Church is independent of the State ; the State should agree with the Church, or defer to it when there is controversy ; the State should profess Roman Catholicism, because that religion is the only true one ; the State should not give equal rights to other forms of worship ; toleration, by the State, of anything opposed to Roman Catholicism, is a defect in the State ; such toleration, however, can be allowed, but only for reasons of expediency, and not as a right, and should be regarded as a regrettable necessity, which it is hoped will, in ' happier times,' not exist.

As we have also seen, the principle of the Roman Catholic Church, in regard to intellectual studies, is that the Church should control the mental life of its adherents, both in their education when they are children at school, and in their reading both then and afterwards. ' Since,' say Addis and Arnold, ' we cannot walk securely in religion one step

except in union with and obedience to the Church, every well-instructed Catholic understands that the Church must preside over the education of Catholics at every stage and in every branch, so far as to see that they are sufficiently instructed in their religion. With regard to non-Catholics, who in modern times are often mixed with Catholics in the same school, the Church accepts in practice what is called the " Conscience Clause." '[1]

What does all this mean? ' The Church must preside over the education of Catholics at every stage and in every branch, so far as to see that they are sufficiently instructed in their religion.' What does ' sufficiently instructed in their religion ' mean? According to Roman Catholic doctrine, the Church is God's infallible vicegerent in matters of faith *and morals*. ' The Church cannot err in what she teaches as to faith or morals, for she is our infallible guide in both.'[2] In what sphere of life are *morals* not concerned? Morality concerns the whole of life; and therefore the Roman Catholic principle, as to education, is that the Church *must control* education. Let us quote a clear statement to that effect :—' " There are people who say that Catholics should give and take in the matter of education; but there could be no question of give and take. The matter was one of principle, and Catholics had nothing to give away." The Catholic position was thus defined by the Most Rev. Dr. Mostyn, Archbishop of Cardiff, when opening a bazaar in aid of the cost of remodelling and enlarging St. David's School, Swansea. His Grace said that Catholic parents demanded for their children a Catholic education in a Catholic school with Catholic teachers, and from that they would not budge.'[3]

Indeed, Dr. Mostyn does not state the claims of his Church even highly enough. He says ' Catholic parents demand.' What he means is that this is the demand

[1] *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 295.
[2] English Roman Catholic *Catechism*, q. 100.
[3] See *The Catholic Times*, November 8, 1929.

they make *to the Government*. He cannot, however, mean that they make this demand *of their own free choice*. The fact is, the Roman Catholic Church *commands* its adherents to make this demand. The New Code of Canon Law (1917) says: 'Catholic children may not frequent non-Catholic schools, nor neutral or mixed ones, which are clearly open to non-Catholics'[1] (*'Pueri catholici scholas acatholicas, neutras, mixtas, quae nempe etiam acatholicis patent, ne frequentent'*); and: 'The following are excommunicated *latæ sententiæ* reserved to the Bishop of the diocese: . . . Parents or those holding the place of parents, who knowingly send children to be educated or instructed in a non-Catholic religion' (*'Subsunt excommunicationi latæ sententiae Ordinario reservatae catholici: . . . Parentes vel parentum locum tenentes qui liberos in religione acatholica educandos vel instituendos scienter tradunt'*).

Thus, 'Catholic parents' are not at liberty to choose what schools they shall 'demand' for their children. '*The Church must preside.*' Indeed, the present Pope (Pius XI) has, by words used in his own person, made the matter quite clear. Speaking on the particular question of education under the 1929 Concordat in Italy, he thus expressed the universal principle of the Roman Church: 'Where we will never be in accord is in anything that seeks to impede, diminish, or deny the right that nature and God have given to the family and to the Church in the field of education. On this point we do not wish to say we are intractable, because intractability is not a virtue, but we do say we are intransigent just as we could not fail to be intransigent if any one asked us how much two and two made. The answer to that is four, and it is not our fault if it is not five or six.'[2] He has issued (1930) an Encyclical on this subject.

Thus it will be seen that the Roman Church claims that

[1] *Codex Iuris Canonici* (Vatican Press, Rome; Burns & Oates, London; 1926), canons 1374 and 2319 (§4).
[2] See *The Catholic Herald*, May 18, 1929.

she has, by Divine right, jurisdiction over the education of children. When, then, Roman Catholic bishops or other clergy refer to the rights of ' the family,' what they mean is the right of the family to be governed *as the Church commands*. And here we come to the words of Addis and Arnold about ' the Conscience Clause.' ' With regard to non-Catholics, who in modern times are often mixed with Catholics in the same school, the Church accepts in practice what is called " the Conscience Clause." ' Why say ' accepts *in practice* ' ? The acceptance of anything is, by the very act of acceptance, a practical act : ' to accept ' *is* ' to accept in practice.' Why, then, use the last two words, which seem a needless tautology ? The reason they are used is easily found. The Roman Catholic Church accepts the Conscience Clause, for ' non-Catholic ' Christians, *only* ' in practice,' and does not endorse *the principle* of the clause. It is, in fact, an example of the Church's ' acquiescing ' in ' certain modern liberties ' ' till better times.' This will be seen clearly from a study[1] of two important decrees of the Council of Trent, which regulated Roman doctrine and discipline in the time of the Reformation.

Canons four and eight, *de baptismo*, of session seven of the Council of Trent, are : ' If any one shall say that baptism when administered by heretics, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, with intention of doing what the Church does, is not true baptism : let him be anathema ' ; and : ' If any one shall say that the baptized are free from the precepts of Holy Church, either written or delivered by tradition, so that they are not obliged to observe them unless they will submit to them of their own accord : let him be anathema.'

That is to say, any baptism is valid if administered with the proper ' matter ' (water), ' form ' (the words, ' in the

[1] *See* Waterworth, *Trent*, p. 56. (N.B.—In the present work Waterworth's English version is not necessarily adopted in every case : the present author translating for himself—but Waterworth's *Trent* is the standard English collection.)

name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost '), and ' intention '[1]; such baptism is valid even if administered by a lay person or by any heretic, Jew, or even heathen; baptism makes the baptized person subject to Roman canon law; and such person, even against his or her will, can be compelled to observe ' the precepts of Holy Church.' In short, Roman canon law claims jurisdiction over *every baptized person*. It regards *every baptized person* as subject to Roman canon law, and claims a right to compel all such persons to obey that law, even though they may not wish to do so. This is the meaning of ' accepting, *in practice*, the " Conscience Clause." ' The Roman Church accepts it only in present circumstances, and from motives of expediency; but does not accept *the principle* of it: indeed, she *condemns* that principle. As regards education, she claims a right to control it and to command people to educate children as she prescribes.

Further, it must ever be remembered that, even apart from schools in which children are educated, the Roman Church's claims to jurisdiction extend to the most intimate affairs of family life. In regard to the very foundation of family life—marriage—the Council of Trent,[2] session xxvi., canons one, four, and twelve, decreed thus: ' If any one shall say that matrimony is not truly and properly one of the seven Sacraments of the Evangelical Law, instituted by Christ our Lord, but that it is a human invention, introduced into the Church, and does not confer grace: let him be anathema '; and: ' If any one shall say that the Church cannot constitute any impediments, with power to disannul matrimony, or that in constituting them she has erred:

[1] This does not mean that the person who administers the baptism must clearly and knowingly intend it in the Roman Catholic sense. As the famous theologian, Bellarmine, says (*De Sacramentis in Genere*, book I, chap. xxvii.), ' By " the Church " is not meant the Roman Church, but the true Church *as understood by the administrator*.' So a Protestant, by administering baptism, makes the person he baptizes a member of the Roman Catholic Church even though he did not know he was so doing or intend so to do!

[2] *See* Waterworth, *Trent*, pp. 194, 196.

let him be anathema'; and: 'If any one shall say that matrimonial causes do not belong to the ecclesiastical judges: let him be anathema.'

It must always be borne in mind that, in the theology of the Roman Church, a Sacrament is a channel of Divine grace of which that Church is the guardian. The Council of Trent, session vii, canons one and thirteen '*de sacramentis*,' said: 'If any one shall say that the Sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, or that they are more or fewer than seven—namely, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony—or that any of these is not truly and properly a Sacrament: let him be anathema'; and: 'If any one shall say that the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church, commonly used in the solemn administration of the Sacraments, may be despised, or omitted, without sin, by the minister, at his pleasure, or that any pastor of a church may change them for others: let him be anathema.'[1]

The Roman Church, then, claims to control marriage as well as education. Its claim to control marriage has of late years been brought prominently before the British public by the issue, by Pope Pius X in 1907, of the *Ne Temere* decree. That decree extended the matrimonial legislation of the Council of Trent—with some minor modifications—to countries, including Great Britain, wherein it had not hitherto been promulgated. 'This law [i.e. the decrees of Trent] was [in the intention of that Council] to be binding only in the places where the decree was published. As a fact, the decree was not published in non-Catholic countries, and hence it was not binding in them. . . . To remove these difficulties the new decree was issued.'[2] It declared that no marriage of a Roman Catholic with a person not of that faith is valid unless celebrated before the Roman Catholic parish priest or his deputy; and no priest will

[1] *See* Waterworth, *Trent*, pp. 54, 55–6.
[2] Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, pp. 611–12.

celebrate such a marriage unless both parties subscribe to an agreement that (1) no other religious ceremony of the marriage shall take place; (2) all children born shall be brought up Roman Catholics; (3) the 'non-Catholic' party shall not interfere with the religion of the 'Catholic.' Also, 'a third promise of striving to the best of (his or her) ability for the conversion of the non-Catholic partner should be made by the Catholic party, at least by word of mouth.' It comes to this: If a 'non-Catholic' marries a Roman Catholic according to the decree *Ne Temere*, he or she loses all voice in the home-life, and becomes a merely tolerated person in his or her own home; or, if the decree is disregarded, the Church of the 'Catholic' partner will say there has been no marriage at all, and that the partners are living in open sin.[1] It will be seen what a source of tyranny the decree is. It is an instrument of disunion in both State and domestic life.

In view of what we have now seen, can it be denied that the Roman Church, owing to the mediaeval principles to which it is committed, is opposed to the principles of modern progressive culture? To say this, is not to deny or belittle the great history, the many noble works, and the individual and corporate holiness, of and in that Church. It is merely to say that the greatness and nobility of the Roman Church have been largely spoiled by its rigid committal to mediaeval traditions, sanctified into a sacrosanct system by an over-centralized system of government. As a result of this, it makes claims, to (1) dominate States, (2) deny the principle of toleration, (3) dominate domestic life and education, and (4) censor literature: and these claims, if they prevailed, would cut at the bases of modern progressive culture. The fact that, even in Roman Catholic countries, such claims cannot be enforced except to a limited extent, is due to the fact that the Reformation deprived the Roman Church of the power to command the services of the 'secular arm.'

[1] See *Marriages of Protestants with Roman Catholics*, by 'Indicator' (London, Protestant Reformation Society, 1928).

Many attempts are made, by Roman Catholic writers, to explain away these facts, and to represent the Roman Church as much as possible as a tolerant body: at least, in regard to State affairs and social life. For example, one able writer says that 'neither in the political field nor elsewhere can there be a real conflict of duties [between loyalty to the Roman Church and to the State]. . . . In the relations between Church and State, as elsewhere, the problem of conflicting loyalties, so called, is always a problem of defining limits'[1]; that 'only in Catholic States . . . does the Catholic doctrine of Church and State find specific application'; that the Roman Church allows toleration of various religions where they have 'formally established themselves and taken root.' To what, however, does all this amount? Merely that the Roman Church 'acquiesces' in liberties when it has not the power, or when it seems inexpedient, to do otherwise.

A prominent English Roman Catholic newspaper, in an article, '"Toleration" Again,' argued thus: 'The principle of dogmatic intolerance [as taught by the Roman Church] is balanced by another equally vital Catholic principle, that, in Leo XIII's words, "no man should be compelled against his will to embrace the Catholic faith: because except he be willing no man can believe." And the Church's practice is to find a fair balance in the application of the two principles.'[2] What does *that* mean? True, a man cannot be made to believe if he won't!—but he can be treated as a criminal and punished. If Leo XIII meant that compulsion may not be exercised on people who reject the 'Catholic faith,' then Leo was a heretic, for, as we have seen, the Council of Trent decreed that, if any one says that, 'let him be anathema.' The truth is, again, that the Roman Church simply says that the exercise, or abstinence from the use of compulsion, is a matter for her decision.

[1] Rev. John A. Ryan, S.J., *The Catholic Church and the Citizen* (Burns & Oates, London, 1928), pp. 23, 31, 32.
[2] *The Universe*, November 8, 1929.

During 1929 the Roman Catholic Church in Great Britain and Ireland celebrated with great rejoicings the centenary of the 'Catholic Emancipation Act' of 1829, by which practically the last of the old penal laws on their creed were repealed. The real facts as to this, however, should be appreciated. Any man will admire the heroism of people who give their lives for their beliefs. During the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and to a lesser degree afterwards also, several hundreds of Roman Catholics—especially priests—were executed in this country under the old penal laws: and also, in Ireland, the working of those laws was tragic to a degree. Indeed, of those laws in Ireland the historian Lecky said: 'It [the Irish penal code] was intended to degrade and impoverish, to destroy in its victims the spring and hope of buoyancy and enterprise, to dig a deep chasm between Catholics and Protestants. . . . It was not the persecution of a sect, but the degradation of a nation.'[1]

Of the 'Catholic martyrs' who died in England, a Catholic Truth Society pamphlet says: 'Who *are* the English martyrs? It is a list of 360 brave men and women who gave their lives here in England and Wales, in the persecution of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, to preserve the Catholic faith for us.'[2] And Cardinal Bourne, Archbishop of Westminster, said: 'Our martyrs desired two things: to continue the same spiritual relations with the Holy See which the English people had maintained and cherished for hundreds of years; and to ensure in England the continued celebration of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. . . . There is in the intrinsic nature of their acts, for which they were condemned and put to death, no trace nor possibility of treason.'[3]

What, however, are the facts? Queen Elizabeth came to

[1] *Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, i., 170.

[2] *Our Martyrs* (C.T.S., 1928), p. 1.

[3] *Pastoral Letter, Lent*, 1928 (London, published by Burns & Oates), pp. 17–18.

the throne in 1559. Although she and her Government re-established the Reformed religion, no Roman Catholic, as such, was put to death until she had been reigning eleven years. In 1570, however, Pope Pius V issued his Bull [1] declaring Elizabeth deposed, and commanding her subjects to refuse allegiance to her ; a Bull accompanied by innumerable plots and also by the fomenting of rebellions here and in Ireland and by the instigations of foreign plans for invasion ; plans which ultimately culminated in the Spanish Armada. The simple truth is : The Reformation was a revolt against a mediaeval clericalized system which claimed to dominate States and to punish, as a capital crime, any dissent from its theological doctrines. Release from that system could, then, be achieved only by fighting ; in that conflict, the intolerant mediaeval system was combated by penal laws against its adherents. The weapons of the mediaeval system were turned against itself. That is the truth about the Roman Catholic martyrs. We can admire their heroism ; we can pity their agonies (even as we admire and pity the heroism and agonies of the ' heretics ' burnt by the Roman Church's adherents) ; but the mediaeval system was the cause of the tragic struggles, and we can rejoice that the struggles resulted, at long last, in establishing in most countries liberty of worship.

We may here draw attention to the obligations undertaken by converts to the Roman Catholic Church. As to how many such converts are made in England, they are officially (and of course accurately) given as about 11,000 annually : about .03 per cent. of the total English population. Probably a considerable number of these do not remain in the Roman Church all their lives ; and, in any case, there is a considerable ' leakage ' from that Church here, as elsewhere. However, we are now concerned not

[1] On this whole subject, a book to study is *English Catholics in the Reign of Elizabeth*, by Rev. J. H. Pollen, S.J. (London, Longmans).

with statistics, but with the nature of the obligations undertaken by converts to the Roman Church.

Any person who applies to a Roman Catholic priest, to be 'received into the Church,' is given a course of doctrinal instruction of a length suitable to his or her individual case. When the priest is satisfied that the neophyte is ready to be received, a form is filled up with particulars, and is forwarded to the Bishop. When that prelate replies with permission to receive the convert, a time is appointed for the priest to receive him or her. The reception takes place in the church. If it is absolutely certain that the neophyte had been previously validly baptized, baptism is not administered. If it is doubtful, then baptism is administered *sub conditione* (with a condition that it is valid only if the neophyte has never been validly baptized before; for the Roman Church holds that baptism is impossible twice). If the neophyte never has been baptized, he is now baptized unconditionally. In any case, a convert has to make a Profession of Faith. He kneels before the altar, by the side of the priest, and—a hand laid on an open Bible—says:

'I [name], having before my eyes the holy Gospels, which I touch with my hand, and knowing that no one can be saved without that faith which the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church holds, believes, and teaches; against which I grieve that I have greatly erred, inasmuch as having been born outside the Church I have held and believed doctrines opposed to her teaching; I now, enlightened by the grace of God, profess that I believe the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church to be the one true Church established on earth by Jesus Christ, to which I submit myself with my whole heart. I firmly believe all the articles that she proposes to my belief; I reject and condemn all that she rejects and condemns, and I am ready to observe all that she commands me. And especially I profess that I believe: One only God in three divine Persons, distinct from and equal to each other—that is to

say, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost ; The Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation, Passion, Death, and Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ ; and the personal union of the two Natures, the divine and the human ; the Divine Maternity of the Most Holy Mary, together with her most spotless virginity ; and also her Immaculate Conception ; the true, real, and substantial presence of the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with His Soul and Divinity, in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist ; the seven Sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ for the salvation of mankind : that is to say, Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, Matrimony. I also believe in Purgatory, the resurrection of the dead, and everlasting life ; the primacy, not only of honour, but also of jurisdiction, of the Roman Pontiff, successor of St. Peter, prince of Apostles, vicar of Jesus Christ ; the veneration of Saints and of their images ; the authority of apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions, and of the Holy Scriptures, which we must interpret and understand only in the sense which our Holy Mother the Catholic Church has held, and does hold, to whom alone it belongs to judge of their meaning and interpretation ; and everything else that has been defined and declared by the sacred Canons and by the ecumenical Councils, especially by the holy Council of Trent, and by the Council of the Vatican. With a sincere heart, therefore, and with unfeigned faith, I detest and abjure every error, heresy, and sect opposed to the said Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church. So help me God and these His holy Gospels, which I touch with my hand.'[1]

The special inwardness and significance of this *credo* is not in the list of particular dogmas which it includes, but in certain apparently incidental clauses ;—' I reject and condemn all that she rejects and condemns, and I am ready to observe all that she commands me ' ; ' the authority of

[1] See *Form for the Reception of a Convert*, edited by Bishop Hedley, O.S.B. (Catholic Truth Society, London).

apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions'; 'and everything else that has been defined and declared by the sacred Canons and by the ecumenical Councils.' These clauses commit the convert to the undefined discretion of the Church. He, or she, must obey '*all* that she commands.' How is he or she to know what is contained in all the 'sacred Canons and ecumenical Councils'? Why, there are few, if any, bishops or priests who could do so! In short, the taking of the above profession of faith is an act unjustifiable on any ground of reason. It is not justifiable on the ground that the Roman Church is Divinely instituted as the one true Church. Even so, there is a distinction between what she teaches by infallible revelation, and what is of lesser authority. In the foregoing *credo*, however, no such distinction is indicated. 'I am ready to observe *all* she commands.' The *credo* exacts too much. Who is to decide what is taught infallibly and what is not? If the convert is to decide, then the Church's authority is gone. If the Church is to decide, then the convert is entirely in the hands of arbitrary authority. Any one who has studied the huge and complicated tomes of 'the sacred Canons and ecumenical Councils' and the Commentaries thereon, will realize what a maze of perplexity one finds oneself in therein. It comes to this: a person taking the above Profession of Faith either (1) determines to be his or her own judge as to what it is obligatory to believe and obey: in which case an eventual exit from the Church probably will result; or (2) determines to believe and do whatever the hierarchy says; in which case there is subjection to unjustifiable despotism. Even on the Roman Church's own theoretic claims to be an Infallible Teacher, the clauses here criticized ought never to exist in a convert's or any one else's *credo*. They ignore the distinction between what is infallible and what is not. However, they are there with a purpose. The whole process of Papal development has been characterized by exacting obedience beyond what even her theoretic claims justify.

A few words as to what is called ' Reunion.' Amongst a small section of Church of England and other people there still exists a dream of reunion with Rome. It was eloquently expressed in 1922 by the venerable Lord Halifax, thus : ' The vision of such a reunion is so transporting that all else fades into insignificance in comparison. What would its realization, and the knowledge that it was no longer a distant prospect but an accomplished fact, be for us? Let us, then, pray to God with an earnestness which will take no denial, and with an absolute determination that our prayer shall be granted, that, with our own eyes, we may be allowed to see the representatives of a reunited Christendom, from East and West, from North and South, gathered in St. Peter's to offer, with one heart and soul, the holy, immortal, and all-prevailing Sacrifice by the hands of Pius XI, in thanksgiving to the Father of all for having, in response to their prayers, given again to His children the blessing of peace.' [1]

It is a vain dream ! With the claims at present made by the Papacy, reunion is UTTERLY IMPOSSIBLE. She can accept nothing but complete submission. In 1928 the Papacy made its reply to such dreams ; and the reply was the *Encyclical Letter, on Fostering True Religious Union, of our Most Holy Lord, Pius XI, by Divine Providence Pope* (the encyclical *Mortalium Animos*, January 6, 1928). In it the Pope said : ' One who supports those who hold these theories and attempt to realize them, is altogether abandoning the divinely revealed religion ' ; ' this being so, it is clear that the Apostolic See cannot on any terms take part in their assemblies, nor is it any way lawful for Catholics either to support or work for such enterprises ' ; ' the infallible teaching authority of the Roman Pontiff, according to the sense in which it was defined by the Ecumenical Council of the Vatican,' must be believed ' with the same faith as [we] believe the August Trinity ' ; and : ' if, as they continually state, they long to be united with Us and

[1] *A Call to Reunion* (Mowbray, London, 1922), pp. 24–5.

ours, why do they not hasten to enter the Church?'[1] In short, compromise is ruled out; there must be total surrender or nothing.

Yet we must remember that 'the arm of the Lord is not shortened.' The Latin Church, like all Churches, has great nobility and holiness. Nobility and holiness do not go for nothing. Perhaps, in the dim future, that nobility and holiness may prevail over the worldly exaggerations of Roman Curial autocracy, and, after tribulations, that autocracy may see the error of its claims. Even more marvellous things have happened in the past. Alternatively, the great Roman Church, increasingly out of touch with the progressive life of the world, will go on asserting and reasserting claims which cannot be enforced on the world at large, but which can produce in that world only a certain degree of disturbance, while the Church which makes them becomes ever narrower, narrower. Who can read the future?

Meanwhile, the duty of religious people of progressive minds is clear. Do not imitate the example of Roman scholasticism, and identify religion with mere formal theological infallibilism. The life of the spirit cannot be measured by any dogmatic footrule. Theology is valuable, as an attempt to express what our souls, nourished on the records of Christ and holy men and women of the ages, feel of God; but do not let our theology be fossilized. Let it develop and be progressive. To quote a fine book which all should read: 'We have to bear our testimony to the truth; and to be eager and dauntless in our search for all its implications.'[2] The providence of God will not leave him friendless or futile, who with head erect and open eyes follows the guidance of the Star of Truth.

[1] Encyclical *Mortalium Animos* (English trans., Burns & Oates, London, 1928), pp. 4, 9, 12, 14.

[2] *The Protestant Faith and Challenge*, by the Rev. R. Pyke (London, The Epworth Press, 1929), pp. 159–60.

APPENDICES

I. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENTS

According to the Roman Catholic Church, there are seven Sacraments, and all were instituted by Jesus Christ. 'If any one shall say that the Sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, or that they are more or fewer than seven—that is, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony,—or that any of these is not truly and properly a Sacrament: let him be anathema.'[1]

As to what a Sacrament *is*, the Roman Church teaches that it is a channel by which Divine grace is conveyed to human souls. 'A Sacrament is an outward sign of inward grace, ordained by Jesus Christ, by which grace is given to our souls.'[2]

It is not, however, taught that all these Sacraments are equal in dignity or necessity: 'If any one shall say that these seven Sacraments are in such sense equal, that no one of them is in any sense more honourable than another: let him be anathema.'[3] The Roman doctrine is that three of them—Baptism, Penance, and Orders—are of paramount *necessity*; but, with regard to *dignity*, the Holy Eucharist is eminently superior to all the rest.

It will have been noted that it is taught that a Sacrament must have an 'outward sign.' For example, in Baptism the sign is the sprinkling with water. 'There must be a visible

[1] Council of Trent, session vii., canon 1. (*See* Waterworth, *Trent*, p. 54.)
[2] Roman Catholic *Catechism* (English), q. 249.
[3] Trent, session vii., canon 3. (*See* Waterworth, *Trent*, p. 54.)

sign. Constantly, indeed, grace is bestowed without any sign at all; God justifies at once the sinner who turns to Him with sorrow and love, and His grace is continually descending on the hearts of the just, but in all these cases there is no sign, and therefore no Sacrament.'[1]

In other words, while the Roman Church does not say that Divine grace is given only by the Sacraments, yet she teaches that they are the ordinary means thereof. 'If any one shall say that the Sacraments of the New Law are not necessary to salvation, but superfluous; so that men may obtain the grace of justification by faith only, without these Sacraments—or without the desire thereof—(although it is granted that they are not all necessary to every individual): let him be anathema.'[2]

It is also taught that the Sacraments (if received in worthy dispositions) always confer grace, and that of their own power. 'If any one shall say that grace is not always conferred by these Sacraments, and upon all persons, so far as God is concerned, if they be rightly received; but that it is only bestowed sometimes, and on some persons: let him be anathema.'[3] 'If any one shall say that grace is not conferred by these Sacraments of the New Law *ex opere operato* [of their own power,] but that faith in the Divine promise is all that is necessary to obtain grace: let him be anathema.'[4]

As to the Sacraments one by one:—

Baptism.—'The form or words used in the Sacrament are "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," or words equivalent to these.'[5] Note the word, 'form.' 'Matter,' and 'form,' are technical words. In baptism, the 'form' is the above words; the 'matter' is water. The water may be poured on ('infusion'), or sprinkled ('aspersion'), or the person may

[1] Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 742.
[2] Trent, session vii., canon 4. (Waterworth *Trent* p. 51.)
[3] Trent, session vii., canon 7. (Ibid., p. 55.)
[4] Trent, session vii., canon 8. (Ibid., p. 55.)
[5] Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 65.

be immersed in it. The usual mode is infusion. The effects of the Sacrament are taught to be regeneration. ' It remits all sin, original or actual. . . . It remits all the penalties due for sin before God, whether temporal or eternal . . . It bestows sanctifying grace and infused virtues. It imprints a " character," or indelible mark on the soul. . . . It makes the recipient a member of Christ and of the Church' [1] [and thus a subject of canon law]. It cannot be repeated. As we have seen elsewhere in this book, the Roman Church recognizes all baptisms, if administered with proper matter and form, as valid. The ' ordinary minister ' of Baptism is a priest ; but that is not *necessary*. Hence, a lay person, man or woman ' or even a heretic, Jew, or heathen ' would confer true baptism, if using the proper matter and form. This should be clearly understood, for from it it follows that the Roman Church looks upon *all baptized persons* as subject to her canon law. It is for her to say how and when she shall assert or enforce that claim.

Confirmation.—' Confirmation comes next in order after Baptism, because it is considered as the completion of Baptism, inasmuch as it confirms and increases that work of grace which Baptism began in us.' ' The " matter " of the Sacrament of Confirmation is the anointing with the chrism, together with the imposition of hands. . . . The Bishop first imposes his hands in general over all who are to be confirmed, and next anoints each one in particular with the holy chrism. The chrism is the most sacred of the three holy oils which are solemnly blessed by the Bishop every Maundy Thursday [the day before Good Friday] ' [2]. When confirming each individual, the Bishop says, in Latin, ' I sign thee with the sign of the Cross, I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen.' While so saying

[1] Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 66.

[2] *A Manual of Instruction in Christian Doctrine*, edited by Provost Wenham (1905 revised ed., London, St. Anselm's Society), pp. 292, 294.

he marks the forehead of the person with the chrism in the form of a cross, and afterwards he gives him a little blow on the cheek, saying, '*Pax tecum*' ('Peace to thee'). Ordinarily, only a Bishop may confirm, but in special circumstances power so to do may be delegated to a priest. Confirmation cannot be repeated.

THE EUCHARIST.—The feelings of Roman Catholics for this, the third of the Sacraments of their Church, can be realized, taking but one example, by these words addressed by Pope Pius X to the Eucharistic Congress in London in 1908: 'The Divine Eucharist should be loved, worshipped, and partaken of more and more among the Christian people. It is indeed from the Eucharist, as from its source, that the spirit of the supernatural life is diffused over the whole body of the Church. Here we have a bond whereby the members of the same body are closely brought together. In this august Sacrament our Sweet Saviour is really present; and truly living, although mystically hidden from us, will dwell in our midst until the end of time.'[1] 'The word [Greek] *Eucharistía* [literally 'thankfulness,' 'thanksgiving'] is used both for the Sacrament and the Sacrifice of Christ truly present under the appearances of bread and wine.'[2]

The central and supreme act of worship in the Roman Catholic Church is the Mass. The derivation of this word is doubtful, but is generally said to be from the *missio*, or 'dismissal of the people,' at the end of the service. The use of these terms, 'Mass,' 'Eucharist,' is rather a matter of custom than of technical law; but 'Mass' is the accepted name for *the whole service*, and Roman Catholics rarely use 'Eucharist' except as meaning *the consecrated species* (the bread and wine after consecration: when, in Roman theology, it is said they are bread and wine only in appearance).

To put the whole matter concisely: according to Roman

[1] *The Story of the Congress* (London, Burns & Oates, 1908), p. 16.
[2] Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 323.

theology, the Mass is the sacrifice of Christ for the redemption of the world ; and, after the priest utters the words of consecration (' *Hoc est enim Corpus Meum,*' . . . ' *Hic est enim Calix Sanguinis Mei* ' . . . ' This is My Body '. . . ' This is the Chalice, or cup, of my Blood ' . . .) the bread and wine cease to be bread and wine, and are Jesus Christ, offered up for the living and the dead. The chief decrees of the Council of Trent on this subject are :— ' If any one shall deny that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially contained the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, together with His Soul and Divinity, and consequently Christ entire ; but shall say that He is present therein only in a sign or figure, or by His power : let him be anathema ' ; ' If any one shall deny that Christ entire is contained in the venerable Sacrament of the Eucharist, under each species [i.e. under ' the appearance ' of wine *and* that of bread] and under every part of each species when they are separated : let him be anathema ' ; ' If any one shall say that a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God in the Mass ; or that the offering is nothing else than giving Christ to us to eat : let him be anathema ' ; ' If any one shall say that by these words, " Do this for a commemoration of Me," Christ did not appoint His Apostles priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests should offer His Body and Blood : let him be anathema ' ; ' If any one shall say that the Sacrifice of the Mass is only a service of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice made on the Cross, and not a propitiatory offering ; or that it benefits only him who receives it, and ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities : let him be anathema.'[1]

It is a binding duty of every Roman Catholic to go to Holy Communion at least once a year, and that at Easter. Until recently, there was a tendency to think it is

[1] Trent, session xiii., canons 1 and 3 ; and session xxii., canons 1,2, and 3. (*See* Waterworth, *Trent*, pp. 82, 82–3, 158–9.)

'irreverent' to go *often*. For example, the celebrated Father F. W. Faber said: 'The seventh enemy with whom we have to struggle, is "familiarity." . . . With the Blessed Eucharist it consists of frequent communion without leave'[1]; and: 'Weekly communion presumptuously gravitates to daily.' However, the present custom is directly opposed to this teaching of Faber's. To quote Addis and Arnold: 'In our own day Pius IX and Leo XIII warmly recommended the practice of frequent and daily Communion. Pius X went further, and warned confessors [priests in the confessional] "not to deter from frequent or daily Communion any one who is in a state of grace and approaches with a right intention" (December 20, 1905).'[2]

PENANCE.—'Penance is defined as a Sacrament instituted by Christ in the form of a judgement for the remission of sin done after Baptism, this remission being effected by the absolution of the priest, joined to true supernatural sorrow, true purpose of amendment, and sincere confession on the part of the sinner.'[3] In every Roman Catholic church there is a 'confessional,' usually taking the form of a small compartment divided into two sections, one for the penitent to kneel down in, while in the other the priest is seated; the sections are separated by a partition, only a small opening, with a wire-netted grating, allowing priest and penitent to speak. The priest asks when the penitent made confession last; and then, what sins he or she has since done. It is only obligatory to confess *mortal* sins.[4] The penitent having given his confession, the priest, if satisfied he or she

[1] *Growth in Holiness* (London, 1872), pp. 121–2, 182.
[2] *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 371.
[3] Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 646.
[4] 'Some sins are mortal, others venial. . . . The former are against the very end of the law, which is the love of God, [and they] utterly destroy charity and grace, cause the death of the soul, and deserve eternal punishment. Venial sin, though it disposes [the sinner] to that which is mortal, and is the greatest of all evils except mortal sin, still does not annihilate the friendship of the soul with God. Venial sin is a disease of the soul, not its death, and grace is still left [in the soul] by which the sin may be repaired.'—Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 777.

is really sorry, gives suitable advice, names a penance, and then pronounces the absolution : '*Ego absolvo te a peccatis tuis in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti*' : 'I absolve thee from thy sins, in the name of the Father,' &c. The penance usually consists of the recitation of some prayers, and the penitent is obliged to perform the exact penance the priest enjoins ; no other will do. Let it be noted that the validity of the absolution depends on the penitent being genuinely sorry and resolved to amend. All Roman Catholics are bound to confess at least once a year, from the time when they reach the 'age of reason' (about seven years old) till death ; but, as confession and absolution are regarded as the remedy for mortal sin, it is looked on as wise to go as soon, after committing any such, as possible. Frequent confession is also looked on as a pious practice, good in itself. Unfortunately, it often tends to produce that noted morbid person in Roman Catholic pious life : the 'scrupulous' person—constantly worrying over imaginary sins. To quote Faber : 'A scrupulous man teases God, irritates his neighbours, torments himself, and oppresses his director [priest to whom he goes]. . . . We fancy that being in motion is necessarily progress. Alas ! we are like the sails of a windmill, always on the move, but only round and round.'[1]

Extreme Unction.—'Extreme Unction,' says the Roman Catholic *Catechism*,[2] 'is the anointing of the sick with holy oil, accompanied with prayer.' . . . 'The name, "Extreme Unction," or "last anointing," by which this Sacrament is known, has been given to it because it is the last anointing administered by the Church to her children. . . . Extreme Unction was instituted by our Lord, to strengthen the dying in their passage out of this world into another. . . . The eyes, the ears, the nostrils, the mouth, the hands, the feet, are each anointed, and the words of the form ['By this holy anointing, and of His own most tender mercy, may the Lord forgive thee whatever thou hast

[1] *Growth in Holiness*, pp. 315, 326. [2] Question 301.

committed by thy sight' &c.] repeated, varying the termination with each of the different senses. The oil which is used should have been blessed by a Bishop on the previous Maundy Thursday.'[1] The Scriptural passage adduced by the Roman Church for Extreme Unction is James, v. 14–15; 'Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests [elders] of the Church; and let them pray over him' . . . &c.

Holy Orders.—The Council of Trent said: 'If any one shall say that under the New Testament there is not a visible and external priesthood; or that there is no power to consecrate and offer the true Body and Blood of the Lord, and remit and retain sins, but only the bare office and ministry of preaching the Gospel; or that those who do not preach are by no means to be considered priests: let him be anathema.'[2] The teaching is, then, that the Sacrament of Holy Orders is that by which the priesthood is constituted. It must be noted, however, that in the Roman Catholic Church Holy Orders are of seven grades: doorkeepers, readers, exorcists, acolytes,[3] subdeacons, deacons, and priests. It is generally held that Bishops are only *priests in the fullest sense*; but there are some theologians who hold that Bishops form a grade of Holy Orders in themselves. In any case, the first six grades give no power to hear confessions, or celebrate Mass; which can be done only by a fully ordained priest having jurisdiction from a Bishop recognized by the Pope. If a priest were ordained by a 'schismatic' or 'heretical' Bishop, the ordination would be valid (i.e. he would be priest), but unlawful. His Masses, though sacrilegious, would be real Masses; but his absolutions of penitents in confession (except in cases of dying persons) would be null and void through lack of jurisdiction.

[1] Wenham, *Manual of Instruction*, pp. 365–7.

[2] Session xxiii., canon 1. (*See* Waterworth, *Trent*, p. 173.)

[3] It is a mistake to apply the word 'acolyte' indiscriminately to any boy serving a priest at an altar. The word to use is 'server.'

MATRIMONY.—We have quoted, earlier in this book,[1] the decrees of the Council of Trent on marriage, so little need be said here. One thing, however, needs to be understood. According to Roman theology, it is not the priest who confers the Sacrament of Matrimony on the two partners, but each partner confers it on the other. 'While the "matter" of the Sacrament consists in the mutual giving up of the contracting parties to one another, the "form" does not consist in the words of the priest—which are intended to acknowledge and ratify the contract just made,—but in the words or outward signs by which the man and woman mutually accept each other as husband and wife.'[2] Therefore, a Roman Catholic ought not to say, 'We were married *by* Father So-and-So,' but, '*before* him.' However, the Roman Church insists that none of her members can be validly married *except* before a priest; and she claims jurisdiction over all the *essentials* of marriage, leaving to the civil State only matters of social convenience.

[1] *See* pp. 127–9. [2] Wenham, *Manual*, p. 379.

II. ROMAN CANON LAW

'CANON Law' (yet again to quote the eminently useful pages of Addis and Arnold [1]) 'is the assemblage of rules or laws relating to faith, morals, and discipline, prescribed or propounded to Christians by ecclesiastical authority. The words "or laws" are added to the definition, lest it be thought that these rules are only matters of publication or persuasion, and not binding laws, liable to be enforced by penalties. The definition shows that the *object* of canon law is "faith, morals, and discipline"; and nothing but these is its object. "To Christians", that is, baptized persons are the *subjects* of canon law; and that without reference to the question whether they are or are not obedient to the Church and within her pale.'

We have seen already in this book [2] the decrees of the Council of Trent by which the Roman Church claims jurisdiction over *all baptized persons*. It must always be borne in mind that that claim is made. Every validly baptized person (Protestant, Eastern Orthodox, or whatever he or she may be) is, in the eyes of Roman canon law, subject to her rules and penalties. It is a mere matter of power and prudence, whether and how far that claim is to be enforced.

ORIGIN OF CANON LAW.—Of course, in the early Church, the scattered and persecuted Christians could form few elements of a legal code. The Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325), after the Roman Empire had taken the Church into its favour, enacted some disciplinary canons as well as decrees on faith. Thereafter, canon laws grew up by degrees, but in no regular form. The Eastern Churches fell more and more away from Rome. In the West, the Papacy tended to assert ever-increasing claims to be the source of all law.

[1] *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 105. [2] *See* p. 126.

In the ninth century the False Decretals were forged. They were concocted in France, in the interests of French ecclesiastics ; but they added to the prestige of the Papacy by ascribing to early Popes powers they never possessed. As to the influence of these forgeries on the growth of Roman canon law, we need quote only two writers, one an orthodox Roman Catholic, and the other a famous opponent of the Vatican Council of 1870. Says Canon W. Barry : 'But a forgery they were. . . . Yet Nicholas [I, Pope] and those who came after him cited the spurious Decretals no less freely than the genuine. They made their way into the official collections ; they became a part of Gratian's *Decretum*, and were embodied in the Canon Law under Gregory IX.'[1] And 'Janus' : 'The most potent instrument of the new Papal system was Gratian's *Decretum*, which issued about the middle of the twelfth century from the first school of Law in Europe—the juristic teacher of the whole of Western Christendom—Bologna. In this work the Isidorian forgeries were combined with those of the Gregorian writers, Deusdedit, Anselm, Gregory of Pavia, and with Gratian's own additions. His work displaced all the older collections of canon law, and became the manual and repertory, not for canonists only, but for the scholastic theologians.'[2] It will thus be seen how greatly sheer forgery contributed to the growth of Roman canon law.

That law, however, has been arranged into compact form only in our own days. In 1904 Pope Pius X appointed a commission to codify the canon law ; but he did not live to see its labours ended. The New Code of Canon Law was issued in 1917, under Pope Benedict XV.[3] It consists of 2,414 canons, divided amongst five 'books' : Book First, General Rules (*Normae Generales*) ; Book Second, Laws

[1] *The Papal Monarchy*, p. 137.

[2] *The Pope and the Council* (English trans., 1876), p. 142.

[3] *Codex Iuris Canonici* (Vatican Press, Rome, and from Burns & Oates, London, 6*s*.).

concerning Persons (*De Personis*); Book Third, Laws concerning Ecclesiastical Affairs (*De Rebus*); Book Fourth, Laws of Legal Processes (*De Processibus*); and Book Fifth, Crimes and Punishments (*De Delicitis et Poenis*). Every aspect of life is dealt with; the prerogatives of the Pope and clergy; the duties of the laity; the Sacraments; excommunications; apostates and heretics ('Those who join, or give public countenance to, a non-Catholic sect, by that very deed are infamous'—*Si sectae acatholicae nomen dederint vel publice adhaeserint, ipso facto infames sunt.*—Canon 2,314, § 3); ecclesiastical law-suits, &c.

It is frequently said, both by Roman Catholics and by others, that the New Code has abolished the old cruel mediaeval punishments. With regard to this, the following considerations should be borne in mind: 1.—In the Middle Ages, the Church did not itself burn people at the stake; it tried them for heresy, and, if it found them guilty, handed them over to the 'secular arm,' which had enacted (*under the influence of the Church*) that burning at the stake is the punishment for heresy: 'Under what law, then, were the English Lollards burnt? Lyndwood's answer is: Under *Ut inquisitionis negotium*, c. 18 *in Sexto*, v., 2. True, you will not find, nor should you expect to find, there any coarse talk of flame and faggot, but you will find there quite enough; the Pope wills that [the Emperor] Frederick's constitutions [for burning heretics] be enforced throughout the world'[1]; that is, the Church got it done by deputy; and so the absence of direct reference to cruel punishments, in the New Code, is nothing to the point. 2.—In the New Code itself are these two canons: 'Canon 23: *In dubio revocatio legis praeexistentis non praesumitur, sed legis posteriores ad priores trahendae sunt et his, quantum fieri possit, conciliandae*'; 'Canon 29: *Consuetudo est optima legum interpres*' ('In a doubtful case the revocation of a pre-existing law is not to be presumed, but later laws should

[1] F. W. Maitland, *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England* (London, 1898), p. 176.

be brought beside earlier, and they be made to agree as much as possible'; and: 'Custom is the best interpreter of laws'); thus, when there is no direct allusion, in the New Code, to the old cruel punishments, we must not conclude that the Church has repented of them. 3.—A fundamental claim of the Roman Catholic Church is that she is a 'perfect society,' i.e. an organism having all the powers of any other society or political body; as Leo XIII said in his encyclical 'on Liberty': 'By a Divine provision, all the rights which essentially belong to a society that is legitimate, supreme, and perfect in all its parts, exist in the Church'[1]: and, this being so, the Church has by no means abandoned a right to do anything it did in the past. The nature of the penalties it may or may not inflict, or call the State to inflict, is entirely a matter for its own prudent judgement.

The New Code is, of course, wholly in Latin. An efficient English translation would be very useful: but it would be difficult, the Code being excessively technical: and no help to producing such a translation can be expected from any Roman Catholic scholar, for translations are forbidden; on the back of the title-page appears a prominent notice: 'No one is allowed, without permission of the Holy See, to print this Code afresh or to translate it into another language' (*'Nemini liceat, sine venia Sanctae Sedis, hunc Codicem denuo imprimere aut in aliam linguam vertere'*). As the Code is for the use of ecclesiastics, and not of the general public, an official translation cannot be expected; and an unofficial one would be denounced as spurious.

[1] *Libertas Praestantissimum*, 1888. (*See The Pope and the People*, Catholic Truth Society, 1929, p. 92.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

NOTE.—Of course, the following list does not pretend to be an adequate bibliography of books on so immense a subject. It is only a catalogue of some especially useful works for further study; and it is scrupulously impartial. Works marked with an asterisk (*) are Roman Catholic.

**The Catholic Encyclopaedia*, 16 vols.: New York and London, 1910–22.

**A Catholic Dictionary*, by Addis and Arnold, 1 vol.: London, 1917.

**The Catholic Directory of England and Wales:* London, Burns & Oates, annually.

**The Irish Catholic Directory:* Dublin, Duffy & Co., annually.

**The Catholic Who's Who:* London, Burns & Oates, annually.

**Catechism of Christian Doctrine* (The English 'Twopenny Catechism'): London, Burns & Oates.

**The Catechism Ordered by the National Synod of Maynooth* (The Irish R.C. Catechism): Dublin, Gill & Son.

**Codex Iuris Canonici* (New Code of Canon Law): London, Burns & Oates.

**A Commentary on the Present Index Legislation*, by Rev. T. Hurley, D.D.: Dublin, Browne & Nolan, 1907.

**The Pope and the People: Letters of Leo XIII, Pius X, Benedict XV, and Pius XI:* London, Catholic Truth Society, 1929.

The Infallibility of the Church, by Dr. G. Salmon: London, Murray, 1914.

**Form for Reception of a Convert:* London, Catholic Truth Society, 2d.

**The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages*, by Mgr. H. K. Mann, 13 vols.: London, Kegan Paul, 1902–25.

**The History of the Popes after the Middle Ages*, by Dr. L. von Pastor (English translation, 18 vols.): London, Kegan Paul, 1891–1929.

The Fact of Christ, by Professor P. Carnegie Simpson: London, Hodder, 1924.

A History of the Church of France, by Rev. W. H. Jervis, M.A., 2 vols.: London, Murray, 1872.

A Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy, by Isaac Barrow, D.D. (Scottish Reformation Society reprint, 1852).

The Pope, the Kings, and the People, by W. Arthur, M.A.: London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1903.

The Fugger News-Letters, ed. by V. von Klarwill: London, The Bodley Head, 1925, &c.

The Petrine Claims, by Rev. R. F. Littledale: London, S.P.C.K., 1889.

The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome, by Rev. F. W. Puller: London, Longmans, 1893.

**The Treaty of the Lateran*, by Rev. B. Williamson: London, Burns & Oates, 1929.

**The Roman Missal, adapted for the Laity*: London, Burns & Oates; various editions.

**The Garden of the Soul* (prayer-book): London, Burns & Oates; various editions.

The Primitive Church, by Canon B. H. Streeter: London, Macmillan, 1929.

The Popish Plot (Titus Oates's conspiracy), by J. Pollock: London, Duckworth, 1903.

**The Struggle for Catholic Emancipation*, and *A Hundred Years of Catholic Emancipation*, by Denis Gwynn: London, Longmans, 1928 and 1929.

The Protestant Faith and Challenge, by Rev. R. Pyke: London, The Epworth Press.

Does Faith Need Reasons? by Rev. Dr. F. Ballard: London, The Epworth Press.

Why not Modern Unbelief? by same writer.

Christian Findings After Fifty Years, by same writer: London, The Epworth Press.

[The above list, of course, is additional to the works mentioned in footnotes of this volume, all of such works being of great value.]

INDEX

Acton, Lord, 104
Alaric, Gothic King, 17
Alexander VI, Pope, 107
Allies, T. W., 105
Anglican Orders, 33
Apostolicae Curae.—See Anglican Orders
Apostleship of Prayer, 9
Autocracy, The Papal, 11, 16, 40 ff.
Aveling, Rev. F., 84

Baptism, R.C. Church and, 126, 150
Barnard, George, 91
Barry, Canon W., 15, 17, 48, 118
Belloc, Hilaire, 106
Benedict IX, Pope, 48
Benedict XV, Pope, 151
Benson, Mgr. R. H., 114
Blessed Sacrament Guild, 9, 89
Bona Mors Society, 9, 89
Boniface VIII, Pope, 58
Bourne, Cardinal, 80
Britten, James, 81

Canalejas, Señor, 60
Canon Law.—*See* New Code
Catenian Association, 89
Catholic Association, 88
Catholic Council for International Relations, 87
Catholic Evidence Guild, 84, 104
Catholic Federations, 85
Catholic Guild of Israel, 84
Catholic Missionary Society, 83
Catholic Reading Guild, 83
Catholic Social Guild, 87
Catholic Truth Society, 81
Catholic Union, 88
Catholic Workers' College, 88
Censorship Act, The Irish, 95
Centrum, Das, 64
Chapman, Abbot J., 118
Chesterton, G. K., 108
Children of Mary, 9, 89
Church and State, 43
Coldwell, G. E. J., 83
Conception, Immaculate, 29
Concordat (Italy, 1929), 56
'Conversion of England,' 77
Converts' Aid Society, 82
Converts to Rome, 82, 133
Council of Constance, 34
Cujus Regio, ejus Religio, 54

Dean, H. S., 91
'Deposing Power,' Papal, 43, 78
'Development of Doctrine,' 24, 101
'Donation of Constantine,' 47
Drummond, Lister, 82
Duns Scotus, 30

Eastern Churches, The, 70
Edict of Nantes, 59

Education, Roman Church and, 80, 124
Elizabeth, Queen, 44, 78
Encyclicals, Papal:
Arcanum Divinæ, 42
Immortale Dei, 16, 42
Libertas, 16, 42, 153
Mortalium Animos, 137
Pascendi, 72
Quanta Cura,, 33, 63
Rerum Novarum, 87
Sapientiæ Christianæ, 42
English and Irish Roman Catholics, 7, 78, 94
'Ex Cathedra,' 33

FABER, REV. F. W., 104, 146, 147
Fascism, 56
'Father Vernon.'—*See* JOHNSON
Fletcher, Rev. Philip, 82
Florence, Council of, 70
Foreign Missions, 69

GALLICAN LIBERTIES, 35
Gasquet, Cardinal, 116
Governor Smith, 63
Great Schism of the West.—*See* SCHISM
Guild of Ransom, 82

HALIFAX, LORD, 136
Heretics and Canon Law, 126, 150
Historical and Foreign Review.—See *Rambler*
Huguenots, 59

IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF THE B.V.M., 29
Index of Prohibited Books, 71
Indulgences, 10
Infallibility of Pope, 30
Innocent III, Pope, 29, 48
Innocent X, Pope, 53
Inquisition, 45, 152
Ireland, 94
Irish and English Roman Catholics, 7, 78, 94
Irish Famine, 79

JOHNSON, REV. VERNON, 118

KNIGHTS OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT, 9, 89
Knights of St. Columba, 89
Kulturkampf, 64

LATERAN COUNCIL OF 1215, 29
Lateran Treaty of 1929, 17, 49, 56
Law of Guarantees, 55
Leo XIII, Pope.—*See* ENCYCLICALS and, 33, 94
Lester, Rev. Edmund, 89
Lingard, John, 99
'Little Flower,' The.—*See* THERESA

MALLOCK, W. H., 112
Manning, Cardinal, 80
Marriage, The Roman Church and, 127, 149
Martin V, Pope, 34
Martyrs, Roman Catholic, 131
Mary, The Blessed Virgin, 29
McNabb, Rev. V., 117
Mivart, St. G., 105
Modernism, 72
'Modern Liberties,' Pope and.—*See* TOLERATION
Mostyn, Archbishop, 124

Ne Temere decree, 128
New Code of Canon Law, 150 ff.
Newman, Cardinal, 23, 101
Newspapers, Roman Catholic, 90
Nicaea, Council of, 23, 150

Oldmeadow, E. J., 91
Oxford Movement, 79

Papal Infallibility, 30
Papal Monarchy in Italy, 46 ff.
Pepin, King of the Franks, 47
Peter, St., 19
Philip the Fair of France, 58
Pius V, Pope, 44, 78
Pius IX, Pope, 39, 56, 79
Pius X, Pope, 79, 128
Pius XI, Pope, 17, 56, 136
Profession of Faith.—*See* Converts
Propaganda, Congregation of, 79
'Protestant dogs,' 109
Protestants, R.C. Church claims jurisdiction over, 126, 150

Quebec, 67

Rambler, The, 105
Ransom, Guild of, 82
Regnans in Excelsis, Bull, 44, 78
'Religious Orders,' 90
'Reunion,' 136
'Revelation cannot be added to.'—*See* Development of Doctrine
Roman Catholic Church in:
Australasia, 68
Austria, 64
Belgium, 66
Canada, 67
Czecho-Slovakia, 66
France, 58
Germany, 63
Great Britain, 75 ff.
Heathen Countries, 69
Holland, 66
Hungary, 65
Ireland, 67, 79, 94
Italy, 55
Malta, 67
Mexico, 61
Poland, 66
Portugal, 60
South Africa, 69
South America, 60
Spain, 59
U.S.A., 62
Rosary, The, 9

Sacraments, 141 ff.
Saints, 10
Sale of the Papacy, 48
Salford Catholic Federation, 85
Schism of the West, Great, 33
Scotland, 93
Sheed, F. J., 104
Silvester I, Pope, 46
Society for Maintenance of the Holy See, 88
'Stations of the Cross,' 9
Stephen II (III), Pope, 32
St. Vincent de Paul Society, 89
Syllabus of 1864, 33, 63

Temporal Power, Papal, 39 ff.

Theresa of Lisieux, St., 10
Thirty Years' War, 53
Toleration, R.C. Church and, 41, 152
Transubstantiation, 26
Treaty of Lateran.—*See* LATERAN TREATY
Trent, Council of, 27, 127, 141

'UNITED ITALY,' 56

VASSALL-PHILLIPS, REV., 116
Vatican Council of 1870, 30
Vaughan, Cardinal, 80
Vaughan, Rev. Herbert, 83

WARD, Maisie, 104
Ward, W. G., 103
Ward, Wilfrid, 104
Way of the Cross, 9
Wells, H. G., 93
West, Great Schism of the.—*See* SCHISM
Westphalia, Peace of, 54
Wiseman, Cardinal, 80

Zelo Domus Dei.—*See* INNOCENT X